Of

WITNESSES

(none)

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros. Def. No. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
789	Excerpts from the Record of Ribbentrop's Talk with MATSUOKA on 29 March 1941		7939
790	Excerpt from the Record of Hitler's Talk with MATSUOKA in the presence of Ribben- trop, Ott and OSHIMA		7943
791	Excerpts from the Record of Hitler's Talk with MATSUOKA on 4 April 1941		7945
792	Ribbentrop's Telegram to the German Ambassador in Tokyo dated 5 July 1941 (No. 598)		7955

Of

EXHIBITS

Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
Entry from the Diary of Smetanin, Ambassador of the USSR to Japan dated 25 June 1941		7956
Telegram of Ott, German Ambassador to Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin 15 July 1941 (No.1248)		7957
Excerpts from the Telegram of the German Ambassador to Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin on 22 June 1941 (No.1012)	7958	
Excerpt therefrom		7958
Telegram from Ott to Berlin dated 3 July 1941 (No.1109)		7961
Telegram of Mackensen, German Ambassador in Rome, sent to Berlin 1 July 1941 (No.1473)		7962
Memorandum of Kramerets, Foreign Ministry official, composed in Berlin in 6 July 1941	6	7965
Telegram from Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, sent to Berlin on 12 July 1941 (No.1200)		7966
Telegram sent from Tokyo by Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, on 1 Aug 1941 (No.1415)		7967
	Entry from the Diary of Smetanin, Ambassador of the USSR to Japan dated 25 June 1941 Telegram of Ott, German Ambassador to Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin 15 July 1941 (No.1248) Excerpts from the Telegram of the German Ambassador to Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin on 22 June 1941 (No.1012) Excerpt therefrom Telegram from Ott to Berlin dated 3 July 1941 (No.1109) Telegram of Mackensen, German Ambassador in Rome, sent to Berlin 1 July 1941 (No.1473) Memorandum of Kramarets, Foreign Ministry official, composed in Berlin in 6 July 1941 Telegram from Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, sent to Berlin on 12 July 1941 (No.1200) Telegram sent from Tokyo by Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, on 1 Aug 1941	Entry from the Diary of Smetanin, Ambassador of the USSR to Japan dated 25 June 1941 Telegram of Ott, German Ambassador to Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin 15 July 1941 (No.1248) Excerpts from the Telegram of the German Ambassador to Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin on 22 June 1941 (No.1012) Excerpt therefrom Telegram from Ott to Berlin dated 3 July 1941 (No.1109) Telegram of Mackensen, German Ambassador in Rome, sent to Berlin 1 July 1941 (No.1473) Memorandum of Kramerets, Foreign Ministry official, composed in Berlin in 6 July 1941 Telegram from Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, sent to Berlin on 12 July 1941 (No.1200) Telegram sent from Tokyo by Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, on 1 Aug 1941

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros. Def. No. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
801	Telegram from Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, sent from Tokyo 4 Sept 1941 (No.1713)	7970	
801-A	Excerpt therefrom		7971
802	Telegram from Tokyo to Berlin dated 30 Nov 1941 (No. 985)	<u>t</u> -	7974
803	Japanese Government Telegram No.739 sent from Tokyo to Berlin on 15 Aug 1941 re the Decision Adopted at the Conference on 2 July 1941	7977	
803-A	Excerpt therefrom		7977
804	Japanese Government Telegram No.740 from Tokyo to Berlin dated 15 Aug 1941		7980
805	Telegram from Tokyo to Berlin dated 6 Dec 1941 (No.1003)		7981
806	Excerpt from Telegram of Ott, German Ambassador in Tokyo, sent to Berlin on 29 Jan 1942 (No.245) (Marked for Identification Only, Exhibit No.639, page 7031)		7983
807	Telegram sent by Ribbentrop from Berlin to the German Ambassador in Tokyo on 15 May 1942 (No.1197)		7984

Of

EXHIBITS

1740 (1976) (1976)	No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
808	3	Telegram from Tokyo to Washington dated 31 July 1941 (No.433) (Marked for Identification Only, Exhibit No.603, page 6643)		7987
809	•	Research Report No. 131 dated 1 Dec 1945 called "Japan's Decision to Fight" published by the General Headquarters of the Supreme Commander for Allied Powers		7988
810		Excerpt from the symposium of the Institute of Total War entitled "The Program of Total War in the First Period", "The Construction of East Asia" drawn up in Feb, 1942		7991
811		Affidavit of Witness NOHARA, Komakichi, Press Agent of the Japanese Embassy in Berlin, dated 15 Feb 1946		7993
812	2	Record of Ribbentrop's Talk with the Defendant OSHIMA on 6 Mar 1943		
812	?-A	Excerpt therefrom		

Of

EXHIBITS

	(conc-a)	
Pros. Def. No. No.	Description	For In Ident. Evidence
813	Report of the Chief of the USSR Naval General Staff dated 20 Feb 1946, (No. 345638)	8026
814	Telegram No. 487 to the Japanese Ambassador in Washington from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Tokyo dated 20 Aug 1941	8032
815	Report of 20 March 1946 of the Military Prosecutor of the Pacific Ocean Area of the USSR	8036
816	Report of 22 March 1946 of the Military Prosecutor of the Pacific Ocean Area of the USSR	8037
817	Report of 4 April 1946 of the Military Prosecutor of the Pacific Ocean Area of the USSR	8039
818	Report of 20 March 1946 of the Military Prosecutor of the Pacific Ocean Area re the sinking of the ship "Krechet"	8041
819	Report on the circumstances of the sinking of the ship "Svirstroy"	8043
820	Report of the sinking of the ship "Sergey Lazo"	8045

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros.	Def. No.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence	
821		Report on the ship "Simphero- pol"		8047	
822		Affadvit of Witness Budarin, B. A., 1st Mate of the ship "Perekop", dated 14 March 1946		8049	
823		Copy of the Protest by Levchenko, Captain of the Motor Vessel "Maikop", dated 1 July 1942		8051	4
824		Report of the Chief Military Prosecutor of the Navy and River Fleet of the USSR, dated 19 Feb1946 (No.0483)		8053	
825		Excerpt of an Announcement of the Japanese Board of Information dated 21 Jan 1943, published in the sym- posium of Official Announce- ments Concerning Foreign Relations (1943)		8055	

1		
1	Thursday, 17 October, 1946	
2		
3		
4	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL	
5	FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal	
6	War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan	
7		
8	The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,	
9	at 0930.	
10		
11		
12		
13	Appearances:	
14	For the Tribunal, same as before.	
15	For the Prosecution Section, same as before.	
16	For the Defense Section, same as before.	
17		
18		
19		
20	(English to Japanese, Japanese to	
21	English, Russian to English and Japanese to	
22	Russian interpretation was made by the	
23		
24	Language Section, IMTFE)	
25		
-		

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.
THE FRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, yesterday, at the close of the session, the Russian prosecution suggested that they were about to introduce more evidence on the activities in the European theatre. I want to register an objection to any further evidence concerning acts, agreements, or alliances made in the European theatre unless they relate particularly to the defendants in the dock and the Japanese alliance.

I merely want to point out that the jurisdiction of this Tribunal extends only to the area
over which General MacArthur has power, and, therefore, any inquiry into agreements, acts or alliances
entered into in Europe are beyond the scope of inquiry of this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Your objection is utterly foolish. We think you are not addressing us at all; you are addressing the rublic.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I want to object further that the Russian prosecution's evidence should be limited to the specific counts in the Indictment which the Russian prosecution limited themselves to

in their opening statement, to wit --

THE PRESIDENT: Every defense counsel is insisting on that without saying so, and we understand it. You must be content to take objections to specific evidence as it is tendered and to give your reasons, and we will deal with them.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, it is very difficult, sitting down here, to catch these things as they go through in these documents when they go from one back to another and take a raragraph from an exhibit that we had last week, and so on. That's the reason I am objecting now.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall read an excerpt from the record of RIBBENTROP's talk with MATSUOKA on March 27, 1941. This document (No. 4005-B) has already been presented by me to the Tribunal and received Exhibit No. 783. This excerpt is numbered 2 in the English copies of the document submitted to the Tribunal.

I quote RIBBENTROP'S words:

"The German armies in the East are available at any time. Should Russia one day take up an attitude which could be interpreted as a threat against Germany, the Fuehrer would dash Russia to pieces. One

is positive in Germany that such a campaign against
Russia would end in a complete victory for German arms
and the absolute destruction of the Russian Army and
the Russian State. The Fuehrer is convinced that in
case of an advance against the Soviet Union a few
months later a power (gropmacht) Russia would no longer
exist."

After two days on March 29, 1941 RIBBENTROP's talk with MATSUCKA was resumed, I shall present in evidence excerpts from the record of this talk, document 527. It will be noted that other excerpts from the record of this talk were presented to the Tribunal before and received exhibit No. 580.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 527 will receive exhibit No. 789.

(Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 789 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote Ribbentrop's

words:

anyway on the Eastern frontiers of the Reich and fully prepared to open the attack at any time. He (the RAM) however believed, that Russia would try to avoid developments leading to war. Should, Germany, however enter into a conflict with Russia, the USSR would be finished off within a few months. In this case, Japan would have, of course, even less reason to be afraid than ever, if she wanted to advance on Singapore. Consequently, she need not refrain from such an undertaking because of possible fears of Russia.

"He (the RAM) wanted to point out to MATSUOKA, in any case, that a conflict with Russia was anyhow within the realm of possibility. In any case, MATSUOKA could not report to the Japanese Emperor, upon his return that a conflict between Russia and Germany was impossible. On the contrary, the situation was such

that such a conflict, even if it were not probable, would have to be considered possible.

"The RAM declared that it was quite possible that the above-mentioned circumstances should very soon lead to a conflict between Germany and Russia.

If Germany felt herself in danger, she would immediately strike and finish off bolshevism.

"MATSUCKA finally agreed to this point of view and gave an assurance that Japan would always be a loyal ally who would devote herself entirely, and not just in a lukewarm way, to the joint effort."

I shall present in evidence an excerpt from the record of Hitler's talk with MATSUOKA in the presence of Ribbentrop, Ott, and OSHIMA on March 27, 1941. It will be noted that other excerpts from this document (No. 1340) were presented to the Tribunal before and received exhibit No. 577.

MR. FURNESS: If the Tribunal please, the way these excerpts were read, it would appear that MATSUOKA agreed to what had just been quoted by the prosecutor. As a matter of fact, the document indicates that he agreed to something which was outlined -- a matter which was not quoted by the prosecutor. The record, therefore, will be misleading. And I think, to make it clear, the recoding -- the matter which is omitted should be read into it. There is also considerable other matter which is omitted which is indicated by the asterisks on the exhibit.

THE FRESIDENT: I do not know whether he has read all that MATSUOKA was suprosed to have said. Certainly, the excerpt that he just read does not carry out all he undertook to prove. The exhibit 789 refers to a conversation between Ribbentrop and MATSUOKA in March, 1941. General Vasiliev also refers to April, 1941. And the next excerpt may be on that; I do not know.

7 8

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, I just wanted to explain that we did not read the other parts of this because they were already read by Mr. Tavenner.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not recollect the dates of the excerpts read by Mr. Tavenner; it was so long ago.

MR. FURNESS: My point is, it has nothing to do with dates, if your Honor please. He quotes the last paragraph: "MATSUOKA finally agreed to this point of view." He omitted the preceding raragraph, so that it appears that he agreed -- that MATSUOKA agreed to the paragraph which the prosecutor read, which is not a question of time but, in question of quotation, is long prior to the final thing which the prosecutor read.

THE FRESIDENT: Of course, I am referring to what he said yesterday afternoon, which was the introduction to the material he has read this morning.

MR. FURNESS: Then we are referring to different things, apparently.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, now, you could have made that objection more intelligible. Had you said he had left out a paragraph which changes the whole of the meaning, we would have known. But I thought

you were referring to the introductory remarks of the prosecutor.

MR. FURNESS: Your Honor stated my point, and I regret that I did not state it more clearly.

THE FRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall present in evidence an excerpt from the record of Hitler's talk with MATSUOKA in the presence of Ribbentrop, Ott, and OSHIMA on March 27, 1941. It will be noted that other excerpts from this document (No. 1340) were presented to the Tribunal before and received exhibit No. 577.

THE FRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Frosecution's document

No. 1340 will receive exhibit No. 790.

(Whereupon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 790 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt on page 3 of the English text. Hitler said:

"On this it should be noted that Germany has made the known treaties with Russia, but still more important than this is the fact that Germany has 160 to 160 divisions at her disposal in case of emergency, for her portection against Russia. In case of this

eventuality she (Germany) has, therefore, not the slightest fear and would not hesitate for a second to draw the consequences at once in case of danger. He, (the Fuehrer) however, does not think that this danger will occur."

I continue to quote on page 4 of the English text:

"Japan is the strongest power in the East
Asia sphere and Russia could not act since there are
150 German divisions standing at her Western border."

On the 4th of April 1941, HITLER had another talk with MATSUOKA in the presence of RIBBENTROP. I shall present in evidence excerpts from the record of this talk (Doc. No. 532-B). It will be noted that other excerpts from the record of this talk were presented to the Tribunal before in the course of the other phase of the trial and received exhibit No. 582.

THE FRESIDINT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 532-B will receive exhibit No. 791.

(Where upon, the document above mentioned was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 791 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote:

"Then MATSU(KA reported on his conversations with Duce and the Pape. With Duce he had had a general conversation on the state of Europe and the war and on the relations between Italy and Germany, as well as on the future development of the world.

"Finally the Italian Chief of State talked about Soviet RUSSIA and America. It was necessary to clearly understand the strength of one's adversaries. America was Enemy No. 1, with Soviet RUSSIA ranking next.

"He (MATSUOFA) agreed with these thoughts."

Now I shall read a document proving -THE FRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: Here again, through omission, we cannot ascertain the meaning of the language in this document. I quote from it: "He (MATSUOKA) agreed with these thoughts." Prior to that, there are several asterisks. We do not know what is omitted.

THE FRESIDENT: Well, you do, but we do not. You have read the lot, and you have the option of asking for more. Whether you have applied or not, I do not know. At least, I take it that the whole of this document was filed with the Clerk of the Court for inspection by the defense if they so desired and have filed an application, by the defense to me, for additional material from the document.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, the presecutor has just said that this is part of exhibit 582. I suggest that we get exhibit 582 and find out what was omitted.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, 582 would have been dealt with in the manner that I suggested.

MR. FURNESS: It is impossible for us, when we read these documents, to know that they are parts of exhibits which are already in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: I know you have a gigantic task, but you must make the best of it.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, perhaps it would save time if we read the part which has been omitted. We omitted it because it had nothing to do with our phase, but we are ready to read it at any moment.

THE FRESIDENT: In this case, I think we might well agree to that course because we do want to know to what MATSUOKA agreed.

MR. GOLUNSKY: I repeat the last sentence read by General Vasiliev. "Finally the Italian Chief of State talked about Soviet Russia and America. It was necessary to clearly understand the strength of one's adversaries. America was enemy No. 1 with Russia ranking next."

Then goes the omitted sentence: "By this remark the Duce gave him to understand that America, as the chief enemy, should be thoroughly watched but should not be provocated. On the other hand, one must be decidedly ready for any contingency."

That is the omitted part. Then comes again the words read by General Vasiliev: "He (MATSUOKA) agreed with these thoughts," which relates to the whole sentence as well as the one read by General

5

3

6

7

/

9

10

11

1.4

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

Vasiliev and the one just read by me.

MR. FURNESS: It is a question for the Court to decide what it relates to; but, until these documents are presented, neither the defense counsel nor the Court can tell what they relate to.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I would like to object on the manner that the prosecution is presenting this evidence and request that on these last three exhibits, for instance, exhibit No. 789, that at the close of the reading of the first paragraph that the prosecution state for the matter of the record that there is an omission, and takes up the second paragraph. Then, if there is a further omission of a paragraph, we don't know whether it is one sentence or several. Then he takes up the next. And that in exhibit No. 790, that the first paragraph read was on page 8 of the original, page 3 of this document, exhibit 790; and that the next paragraph read is from page 11 of the original.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, neither the defense nor the prosecution want the lot read, and, therefore, we have to trust to the judgment of the prosecutor. But, if you have a grievance about any particular part, you are always at liberty to state it.

I think that we would expect you to confine yourselves to objections to particular matters and not to indulge in any general review, Captain Brooks. The points you emphasize are elementary to us, and I have no doubt they are to you. Now I think we have dealt with the whole of this extract. You may be able to point out objections later to other extracts.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, the point I was trying to make is that this would avoid our having to interrupt. In other words, all that would be left to do would be for the defense to bring in these other omissions if the prosecution, in turn, would point out at the time that there was an omission between these paragraphs as they read them, because they have not been pointing that out, and that's why we have been raising this point is because the omissions are there, and on the record it does not show that there was any part, by asterisks or otherwise, in between. And, if they would do that, we would not have to call the Court's attention to it.

I request, as a matter of orderly procedure, that the prosecution be required to point out any breaks in the thought or the left out portions of what evidence they are presenting here.
That is all.

THE PRESIDENT: Minister Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: Since they are under this conception, I want to say that we use such formal quotations only in case when the whole document has been previously filed with the Tribunal and distributed among the defense counsel. Before we finish the presentation of each part of our case, we supply the defense with a list of documents we are going to produce, where the exhibit numbers are shown. But the last request of the defense that the prosecution should point out each break is quite fair, of course, and we are going to do so.

THE FRESIDENT: A colleague inquires whether exhibit 582 was the subject of an application in Chambers. I am sure it was.

MR. GOLUNSKY: It was not because the whole document has been processed and distributed among the defense counsel.

THE PRESIDENT: That means the defense got the whole lot.

MR. FURNESS: It does. But, when we get document No. 532-B, there is no way that we can tell that it is part of exhibit 582. In other words, it

should not be a separate exhibit at all. He should just read from exhibit 582.

& Y e 1 d e n

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

THE PRESIDENT: I fully agree with you that is how it should be dealt with here. Nevertheless, the objections you raise will not be met in that way; you will still have these objections. You will ask for more material to be read. I observe that the prosecutor is always ready to read additional material if he is asked; and if he were approached without a special application to us, I feel that a lot of time would be saved. If he refused in any case, then you might apply.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Now I shall read a document proving that these talks of Germany's preparation to attack the U.S.S.R. were at that time no news to MATSUOKA. I have already presented in evidence excerpts from Ribbentrop's talk with OSHIMA on February 23, 1941, which received exhibit No. 632, prosecution document No. 531. In the course of this talk Ribbentrop, as is to be seen from an excerpt I am going to quote, informed OSHIMA of military preparations against the U.S.S.R.

I quote Ribbentrop's words. The excerpt is numbered 2 on the English copies of the document:

"Military, the Reich Foreign Minister continued, the Fuehrer had created a number of new

22 23

24

formations during the winter. In the spring 240 divisions, including 186 first-class attack divisions, are available." (Omission)

"Should Germany lose the war, the Soviet star would rise over Europe. "We observe the situation in the East attentively and with supreme calm. A German-Russian conflict, however, would result in a gigantic German victory and signify the end of the Soviet regime." (Omission)

"However, Japan, in its own interest, should come in as soon as possible. This would destroy England's key position in the Far East, Japan on the other hand would thus secure its position in the Far East, a position which it can acquire only through war." (Omission)

I continue to quote: "Ambassador OSHIMA agreed with me entirely and said that he would do everything to carry through this policy."

We have one more conclusive proof that in

March 1941 MATSUOKA, Japanese Minister of Foreign

Affairs, was not only informed by Ribbentrop of

German preparations for an attack against the U.S.S.R.,

but even promised Japan's support to Germany and

assured Ribbentrop that the Neutrality Pact between

Japan and the U.S.S.R., which MATSUOKA was going to

conclude, would be put aside in case of an outbreak of war between Germany and the U.S.S.R. This is Ribbentrop's telegram to the German Ambassador in Tokyo dated July 5, 1941, No. 598. I shall present it in evidence, document No. 4062-G.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I am SHIMANOUCHI, counsel for the defendant OSHIMA.

In the document just read, 765 -- Exhibit
765 -- prosecution document 531, before the words,
OSHIMA agreed to Ribbentrop's words, there is the
following omission: "3. Should it seem to be in the
interest of Japan also to secure for itself still
during the war in consideration of the coming New
World Order the position it wants to hold in the Far
East at the time of a peace treaty." These words have
been omitted. I call the Tribunal's attention to this
omission.

THE PRESIDENT: "e will leave it at that.

The question arises as to whether we should permit these interruptions, but your interruption is made before I understand that it exists -- before I understand that it is an interruption. However, counsel's contributions may be fully warranted. "e will be able to consider that later.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I repeat my last sentence:
This is Ribbentrop's telegram to the German Ambassador
in Tokyo dated July 5, 1941, No. 598. I present it
in evidence, document No. 4062-G.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 4062-G will receive exhibit No. 792.

("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 792 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote the excerpts from this telegram:

"The subject of a Japanese-Soviet Treaty of Non-Aggression or Neutrality has been touched upon by MATSUOKA and myself in our conversation of 28 March 1941."

I omit a few lines and continue to quote on page 2 of the English text:

"In the same ay, there may be an occasion in the further course of events to remind MATSDKA that during the same conversation in which he discussed the conclusion of the Japanese-Soviet Treaty with you, he made the following noteworthy statement: 'Should Germany come to blows with the Soviet Union, no Japanese Premier or Foreign Minister would ever be

able to keep Japan neutral. In this case Japan would be driven by the force of necessity to attack Russia at the side of Germany. No Neutrality Pact could alter any of this.'"

The documents which I am going to present prove that that attitude of principle in case of an outbreak of war between Germany and the Soviet Union, MATSUOKA, Japanese Foreign Minister, did his best to put into practice in so far as it depended upon him when Germany treacherously attacked the U.S.S.R. I present in evidence an entry from the diary of Smetanin, Ambassador of the U.S.S.R. to Japan, dated June 25, 1941, document No. 1886.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1886 will receive exhibit No. 793.

(Thereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 793 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt:

"I asked MATSUOKA the basic question concerning the attitude of Japan towards the war; I asked him
whether Japan would remain neutral, the same way as
the U.S.S.R. was, in accordance with the neutrality
pact between the U.S.S.R. and Japan of April 13 of the

current year.

"MATSUOKA evaded a direct answer to this question and said that his attitude to this problem had already been expressed (on April 22 of the current year) in his statement made by him upon his return from Europe. At the same time he emphasized that the Tripartite Pact was the basis of the foreign policy of Japan and if the present war and the neutrality pact happened to be at variance with that basis and with the Tripartite Pact, the neutrality pact 'will not continue in force.'"

In confirmation of all this recorded in Smetanin's diary, I present in evidence a telegram of Oct, German Ambassador to Japan, sent from Tokyo to Berlin, No. 1248, document No. 4052-H.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 4052-H will receive exhibit No. 794.

(Thereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 794 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote:

"Director European Section informed me that the Soviet Ambassador, on Saturday, announced himself to MATSUOKA for an urgent conversation in order to

ask, in the name of his government, whether the neutrality pact would be applied, on the part of the Japanese, to the present German-Russian war.

MATSUOKA replied that the neutrality pact could not be applied to the German-Russian war. It was concluded at a time when the German-Russian relations were essentially different.

"Russian Ambassador, who had expected a statement that would set his mind at ease, was much taken aback by this declaration."

I present for identification a telegram of the German Ambassador to Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin on June 22, 1941, No. 1012, document No. 4033-D.

I present in evidence excerpts from the telegram from which may be seen that MATSUOKA literally on the first day of the German attack on the U.S.S.R. expressed the extremely hostile attitude of the Japanese Government toward the U.S.S.R.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 4033-D will receive exhibit No. 795 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 795 for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The excerpt is admitted on

ask, in the name of his government, whether the neutrality pact would be applied, on the part of the Japanese, to the present German-Russian war.

MATSUOKA replied that the neutrality pact could not be applied to the German-Russian war. It was concluded at a time when the German-Russian relations

were essentially different.

"Russian Ambassador, who had expected a statement that would set his mind at ease, was much taken aback by this declaration."

I present for identification a telegram of the German Ambassador to Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin on June 22, 1941, No. 1012, document No. 4033-D.

I present in evidence excerpts from the telegram from which may be seen that MATSUOKA literally on the first day of the German attack on the U.S.S.R. expressed the extremely hostile attitude of the Japanese Government toward the U.S.S.R.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 4033-D will receive exhibit No. 795 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 795 for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The excerpt is admitted on

the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: And the excerpt therefrom bearing the same prosecution document number will receive exhibit No. 795-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 795-A and was received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall read a passage from these excerpts on page 2 of the English text. It is numbered 1 in the English copies of the document containing MATSUOKA's statements made to the German Ambassador to the effect that: "He (i.e., MATSUOKA) personally was of the same opinion as before that in the long run, Japan could not remain neutral, in this conflict."

I omit a few lines which are immaterial.

I continue to quote: "Towards the end of the interview MATSUOKA received another telegram from OSHIMA wherein the Reich Foreign Minister called attention to an alleged Russian withdrawal of troops from the Far East. MATSUOKA explained spontaneously that he would immediately propose counter-measures."

Another excerpt from this document will be read in connection with some other questions.

4 5

10,

Now I shall present evidence that the

Neutrality Pact between the U.S.S.R. and Japan grossly
violated by Japan, both in the interests of Japan and
Germany, in the course of Germany's war against the

U.S.S.R. The Pact, dated April 13, 1941, has been
presented to the Tribunal, exhibit No. 45. Japan's
attitude towards Germany's attack against the U.S.S.R.

was first of all defined by a most important official
document -- the decision of the conference on July 2,
1941, presided over by the Emperor at which were
present military and political leaders of Japan.

I have presented in evidence on the other issue the excerpts from this decision, prosecution document No. 1652, exhibit No. 779. I shall read an excerpt relating to this issue.

I respectfully call it to the Tribunal's attention that the following words precede the quoted passage in the minutes of the conference, Item "C", Section II. "C. Though the spirit of the Tripartite axis will form the keynote of our attitude toward the German-Soviet war we shall not intervene for a while, but take voluntary measures by secretly preparing arms against the Soviet Union."

In that case the passage quoted further has direct bearing upon the contention we are proving

now:

"Meanwhile, diplomatic negotiations will be continued with detailed precautions; and should the conditions of the German-Soviet war progress favorably to Japan we shall use arms to solve the northern problems, thereby securing stability in the northern regions."

This decision was kept top secret while it was officially declared that Japan observed the Neutrality Pact with the U.S.S.R. What it really amounted to may be seen from a telegram of Ott sent from Tokyo to Berlin on July 3, 1941, No. 1109, in which Ott reported about the subject matter of his talk with MATSUOKA, document No. 4062-E.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 4062-E will receive exhibit No. 796.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 796 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt:

"MATSUOKA said the reason for the formulation
of the Japanese statement to the Soviet Ambassador was
the necessity to deceive the Russians or at least to
keep them in a state of uncertainty, owing to the

ermaments still being incomplete. At present Smetanin was not aware of speedy preparations being made against the Soviet Union as is hinted at in the government resolution transmitted to us."

A number of documents which I offer in evidence show ceaseless military preparations of Japan against the U.S.S.R. in that period. I shall present in evidence a telegram of Mackensen, German Ambassador in Rome sent to Berlin on July 1, 1941, No. 1473, document No. 4062-F.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 4062-F will receive exhibit No. 797.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 797 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: In that telegram Mackensen reported about the visit of the Japanese Ambassador in these words. I quote an excerpt:

"He intimated that Japan has the intention to actively advance /Vorgehen/against Russia on its part, but needs a few more weeks. Such a policy, however, necessitates the resignation of Mr. MATSUOKA; since the latter has only recently concluded a pact of non-aggression with Soviet Russia, he would have

to leave the political arena, at least for a certain period of time."

I shall quote in evidence an excerpt from a telegram of the German Ambassador to Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin on July 3, 1941, No. 1102, document No. 4062-A, concerning military preparations of Japan against the U.S.S.R. This telegram was presented to the Tribunal in the course of the previous phase and received exhibit No. 636. Therefore, if your Honor please, I confine myself to quoting this excerpt, which should not receive its separate exhibit number.

I quote the third paragraph from the bottom of the page:

preparing for all possible eventualities as regards the U.S.S.R. in order to join forces with Germany in actively combating the Communist menace. Japan is keenly watching developments of conditions in Eastern Siberia in particular, determined as she is to destroy the communist system established there. It is, I believe, hardly necessary to add that the augmentation of military preparations, among other things, with an eye to realizing this object, together with the aim of restraining Soviet Russia in the Far East in her

struggle with Germany is steadfastly kept in the mind of the Japanese Government."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Blewett:

MR. BLEWETT: If your Honor please, we are a little confused; we do not have document No. 4062-A, B, or C, although we understand that the counsel said something about it being formerly introduced. We understand it is exhibit 636, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall quote in evidence an excerpt from a telegram of Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, sent from Tokyo to Berlin on July 4, 1941, No. 1350, document No. 4062-B, concerning military preparations of Japan against the U.S.S.R. This telegram was presented to the Tribunal in the course of the other phase of the trial and received exhibit No. 638. Therefore, if your Honor please, I confine myself to quoting this excerpt which should not receive its separate exhibit number. The telegram begins with the words:

"Military attache reports following personal impression from conversation with Japanese General Staff:

"Japanese Army is zealously preparing and under emphatic secrecy."

24

23

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I omit item 1 and quote item 2: "A surprise,though not rush - commencement of hostilities against
Russia, with the seizure of the coastal province as
the first goal."

I offer in evidence one more document dealing with the same issue, namely the memorandum of Kramarets, Foreign Ministry official, composed in Berlin on July 6, 1941, document No. 4062-H.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 4062-H will receive exhibit No. 798.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 798 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: "The Army High Command has informed us on 6 July:

Military Attache, in Berlin called on Colonel
von Lahousen, Chief of Counter Intelligence Section
II, on 4 July 1941, accompanied by Major Higuchi, and
said the following:

"The Japanese General Staff has commissioned him to communicate /to us/ that the Japanese General Staff is ready to carry out sabotage attacks against Soviet Russia in the Far East, especially from Mongolia

3 4

and Manchukuo and, primarily, against the area adjoining Lake Baikal."

I tender in evidence one more document dealing with the same issue, namely Japanese military preparations against the U.S.S.R., a telegram of Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, sent from Tokyo to Berlin on July 12, 1941, No. 1200, to the German High Command of Armed Forces, document No. 4062-C.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 4062-C will receive exhibit No. 799.

(Thereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 799 and was received in evidence.

GENERAL VASILIEV: (Reading)

- "A. I believe the following individual measures for Japanese preparations for war seem to have been taken:
 - "1) Numerous officers called to new jobs.
- "2) Reserves of 24 years to 27 years allegedly called up.
 - "3) Additional car drivers called up.
 - "4) Requisition of tractors in Manchuria.
 - "5) Students not allowed to travel far.
 - "6) Russian speaking persons called up.

in

3

1

5

7

8

10

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23 24

25

"B. Allegedly only three divisions are kept in readiness for the occupation of Saigon which is expected on 17 July according to rumors.

"C. Replenishment of the Kwantung army for a war against Soviet Russia which is not yet imminent, evidently via Shanghai and Tientsin where reservists (cf.A2) and to begin with, about two Japanese divisions including the 16th, are being sent.

"D. In China major Japanese operations are unlikely at present."

I present in evidence on the same issue a telegram, No. 1415, sent from Tokyo on August 1, 1941, by Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, document No. 4025-D.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 4025-D will receive exhibit No. 800.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 800 and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from this telegram in which Ott mentions the following words of YAMAMOTO, Ministry Secretary of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs: "He strongly underlined that Japan made the Anglo-Saxon powers very uneasy by her newly won position of power and that she has strengthened her pressure a great deal in favor of the Axis powers.

which is being carried through with the intention of destroying the Russian military forces in the Far East. The Soviet Government is officially reserved, but according to reliable informations, is watching the mobilization with increasing anxiety and will hardly decide to move more troops to the "est."

Further in this telegram Ott says:

whom I visited again during the past days in his place of convalescence, had pointed out to me as being serious, anticipatedly asked whether Japan intended to start her active advance with demands on the Soviet Government, the Vice-Minister marked this way as the best method of finding a defensive excuse for a Russo-Japanese attack in face of the neutrality agreement. He is personally thinking of demands of such sharpness that the Soviet Government could not possibly be able to accept them, whereby he seemed to have territorial cessions in mind."

Finally, on the same issue, namely military

preparations of Japan against the U.S.S.R. and the time of the proposed attack, I shall read an excerpt from a telegram of Ott, German Ambassador to Japan, sent from Tokyo to Berlin on October 4, 1941, No. 1974, which has already been presented by me in evidence, prosecution document No. 4065-A, exhibit No. 788-A. This excerpt is numbered 2 in the English copies of the document:

"Japan's waging of a war against the

Far Eastern Army, still considered as being in fighting trim, is not feasible before next spring, unless
a moral collapse of the regime comes about. The
tenacity displayed by the Soviet Union against Germany
indicates that not even by a Japanese attack in
August or September could the route via Siberia be
opened up this year."

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1043, a recess was taken until 1102, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.
THE PRECIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: It is known from the actual course of events that Japan did not attack the USSR, but we shall present evidence showing why the Japanese attack against the USSR did not materialize.

A rather detailed explanation of the reasons due to which the Japanese military could not attack the Soviet Union in summer and autumn of 1941 is given in a telegram of Ott, German Ambassador to Japan sent from Tokyo on September 4, 1941, No. 1713.

I present the entire telegram for identification (Document No. 4080-A). I shall offer in evidence an excerpt from this telegram.

CLERK OF THE COUPT: Prosecution's document No. 4080-A will receive exhibit No. 801 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 801 for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The excerpt is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: And the excerpt therefrom,

24

bearing the same prosecution document number, will receive exhibit No. 801-A.

("hereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 801-A and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILILV: Quote:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

"Even after MATSUOKA's dismissal, The Third KONOYE Cabinet was set to undertake a far-reaching mobilization as a result of the decision of 2 July which was adopted in the presence of The Emperor; by its very nature this mobilization was directed against the Soviet Union. Accordingly, KCNCYE considerably strengthened impeding elements of the new Cabinet, and, to a great extent, placed the responsibility upon the Navy. Thus a cover of the rear to the North was greatly impeded. As reported, the Army Command in recent inquiries has become more reserved as to a clash with the Soviet Union. It is being argued that the Japanese Army, tied up and weakened in the war against CHINA, was not in a position to start on a 20 winter campaign against the SOVILT Union. In view of 21 the resistance put up by the Russian Army against an 22 army such as the German, the Japanese General Staff 23 does not believe itself capable of achieving a decisive 24 success against RUSSIA before Winter sets in. More-25

over, it is probably guided by the thought of NOMONHAN, still vivid in the memory, notably of the KWANTUNG Army. The exaggerated conception of Russian strength is partly based on the misleading argument that even in view of the collapse of the UKRAINE front the Soviet Union still disposed of sufficient fighting forces for taking the offensive against PERSIA on the nearby CAUCASUS front.

"In view of this appraisal of the situation, the KWANTUNG Army allegedly pressed for a decision of the Imperial Headquarters. I learned from a usually reliable source that the Imperial Headquarters in the last days came to the decision to postpone action against the SOVIET Union. A new decision was contemplated, to be taken as soon as clear signs of the decomposition of the Far Eastern Army appear or when a great numerical superiority of the Japanese army is established."

I shall quote a excerpt from the defendant OSHIMA's minutes of interrogation dated April 22, 1946 offered by me in evidence before (Prosecution Doc. No. 4121, Exhibit No. 776) to show that the Japanese Government bearing in mind the prospects of attacking the USSR was closely watching the course of German-Soviet war up to the time when it received the explana-

tion of the German Government about the slowing up of its offensive operations.

This excerpt is numbered 3 in the English copies of the document (pages 3 - 4 of the English text).

"Question: How did you inform your Government as to the course of the German-Soviet war?

"Answer:

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

Approximately at the end of July or at the beginning of August 1941 I learned about the slowing up of the pace of the advance of the German army. The advance was not proceeding according to plan. Moscow and Leningrad were not taken according to the German plan. I asked information from Ribbentrop on that subject. Ribbentrop invited Keitel to explain the matter. Keitel told me that the slowing up of the advance of the Gorman army was caused by the excessive length of communications and rear units lagging behind, and that that was the reason why the pace of the advance of the German army was approximately three weeks behind plan."

24

23

general Vasiliev (Continuing): Now I shall present in evidence the documents proving that the Japanese Government, Minister for Foreign Affairs included, conducted the same policy towards the USSR after the change of Cabinet in July 1941 when MATSUOKA no longer was Minister for Foreign Affairs. Therefore, that policy cannot be considered only MATSUOKA's policy, but was a policy consistently conducted by the Japanese ruling militaristic clique as a whole. I present in evidence document No. 2593-D(21), a telegram from Tokyo to Berlin sent on November 30, 1941, No. 985.

This document is one of the intercepted radio messages which have already been admitted for identification and received exhibit No. 603, Prosecution Document No. 2593-D(21).

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2593-D(21) will receive exhibit No. 802.

("hercupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 802, and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from the telegram, items 4 and 5 on page 2 of the English text.

mans and Italians question you about our attitude toward the Soviet, say that we have already clarified
our attitude toward the Russians in our statement of
last July. Say that by our present moves southward
we do not mean to relax our pressure against the Soviet
and that if Russia joins hands tighter with England
and the United States and resists us with hostilities,
we are ready to turn upon her with all our might; however, right now, it is to our advantage to stress the
south and for the time being we would prefer to refrain from any direct moves in the north.

"5. This message is important from a strategic point of view and must under all circumstances be held in the most absolute secrecy."

MR. BLEWETT: If the Tribunal please, we ask the prosecution who sent that telegram -- who sent the telegram and to whom was it sent.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, as General Vasiliev said, this telegram is from a group of intercepted messages already admitted by the Tribunal, and under those messages the name of the person who signed the telegram is not mentioned; but it is clearly shown that the telegram emanated from the Japanese Foreign Office.

MR. BLEWETT: "e do, not believe, your Honor, that that telegram has any probative value, and therefore ask that it be excluded.

THE PRESIDENT: Your submission will be considered.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall present in evidence a Japanese Government telegram No. 739 sent from Tokyo to Berlin on August 15, 1941, document No. 15-F(3), to prove that the decision adopted at the conference on July 2, 1941 to secretly carry on military preparations against the USSR camouflaging them by diplomatic negotiations, was actually carried into effect.

This telegram was published in the symposium

"Pearl Harbor", an official government publication issued in "ashington. Simultaneously I present this symposium for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 15-F(3) will receive exhibit No. 803 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 803 for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The excerpt is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: And the excerpt therefrom, bearing the same prosecution's document number, will receive exhibit No. 803-A.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 803-A, and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I should like to point out that in this document also, together with certain others that are yet to come, bear no evidence whatever of their origin, from whom they were sent or to whom they are going, and are, therefore, objected to on the same grounds.

THE PRESIDENT: All these intercepted messages

3

6

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or what purport to be intercepted messages are admitted. The Court will have to determine later the extent of their probative value.

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from the telegram:

"At time time of my conversation with Ambassador Smetanin the other day, I mentioned our desires in regard to the full realization of our rights and interests in Northern Saghalien and also the removal of danger zones in the waters of the Far East. Since then, we have been asked by the Soviet as to the attitude of Japan toward the German-Russian war; to which we have replied that there has been no change in our intentions of continuing friendly relations between Japan and Russia, that thus far we have maintained an attitude of observing the neutrality pact, and that it is still our desire to continue this in the future, but, that whether or not we can continue thus is a question that depends on the way in which the Soviet Union responds to this. For instance if (a) any of the Soviet Union's territory in East Asia should be ceded, sold, or leased to a third power, or offered as military bases, (b) the Soviet Union should take any steps that would cause the sphere of any third power's military movements to be extended

7,979 into East Asia, or should conclude with a third power an alliance that might have the Empire as its object, we certainly could not overlook the threat that this would be to our nation. "To this the Soviet Ambassador replied, that the Soviet government is rigidly observing the Japanese-Soviet neutrality pact, and that as far as the above mentioned two points are concerned he could give assurance that there has been nothing of the kind and that there will be none in the future."

GENERAL VASILIEV (Continuing): That is what the Soviet Ambassador was told.

And now I shall present to the Tribunal a document showing how the same talk was described in a conversation with the German Ambassador.

I shall present in evidence document No.

15-F(4), a Japanese Government telegram No. 740 from
Tokyo to Berlin dated August 15, 1941 from the same
symposium "Pearl Harbour."

CLETK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 15-F(4) will receive exhibit No. 804.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 804 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt containing a question put by Ott, German Ambassador in Tokyo, about the talk with the Soviet Ambassador which I have just mentioned:

"The Soviets do not have the impression that Japan will not take part in the German-Soviet war."

The telegram goes on:

"To this I replied that in view of the military expansion the Empire is at present effecting, I
think under present existing conditions the abovementioned arrangement with the Soviet is the very best

4

7

9

10

11

13

15

16 17

18

20

22

21

means of taking the first steps toward carrying out future plans concerning the Soviet which will be undertaken together with the German Government, that this is entirely in harmony with the spirit and objectives of the Tripartite Treaty, and that I hoped that the German Government would fully understand this point."

Now I shall present in evidence a telegram from Tokyo to Berlin dated December 6, 1941, No. 1003, proving that the attack on the Soviet Union was a matter of time and situation. (Document No. 2593-D(37). It is a part of the entire document which received exibit No. 603 for identification only.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2593-D(37) will receive exhibit No. 805.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 805 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote the following excerpt from the telegram:

"From the standpoint given in 4 of my #985b, we would like to avoid bringing about any situation likely to result in an armed clash with Soviet Russia until strategic circumstances permit it;

.

and so get the German Government to understand this position of ours and negotiate with them so that at least for the present they would not insist upon exchanging diplomatic notes on this question."

I shall read an excerpt from a telegram signed by Ermansdorf, member of the German Legation at Bungkok, dated November 17, 1941 to the Reich Foreign Minister, Document Number 11-A(6).

This telegram was presented to the Tribunal in evidence in the course of the previous phase of the trial and received exhibit No. 655. Therefore, if your Honor please, I confine myself to quoting this excerpt which should not receive its separate exhibit number.

I shall read an excerpt containing OSHIMA's statement to the German Government:

"He is of the opinion that in view of the time of year, military operations against the Soviet Union could take place only on a limited scale. It probably would not prove too difficult to occupy the northern (Russian) part of the island of Sakhalin. In view of the severe losses which the Soviet troops have suffered at the hands of the German troops, they could also probably be driven away from the border. However, any attack on Vladivostok or even any advance

toward Lake Baikal at this time of year was scarcely possible and would under present circumstances have to be postponed till Spring."

I shall present in evidence an excerpt from a telegram of Ott, German Ambassador in Tokyo, sent to Berlin on January 29, 1942, No. 245, proving that the Japanese Government was only waiting for a favorable moment to attack the USSR and did not cease preparing for the war against her. Document No. 11-A-(7).

It will be noted that document No. 11-A-(7) received exhibit No. 639 for identification only.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COUFT: Prosecution's document No. 11-A-(7) will receive exhibit No. 806.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked p osecution's exhibit No. 806 and received in evidence.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote the end of page 3 of the English text.

"According to very confidential information, however, military preparations against Russia are under way in Manchuria. Influential circles here are of the opinion that after the conquest of Port Darwin, Japan must turn against Russia and seize Vladivostok, the coastal province and North Sakhalin in order

10 11

1

2

4

7

8

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

Morse & Duda

(

definitively to make itself also secure in the north."

I tender in evidence a telegram by Ribbentrop,
No. 1197, sent from Berlin to the German Ambassador in
Tokyo on May 15, evidently 1942 judging by its contents,
proving that on the one hand Germany insisted on Japan's
entry into the war, on the other she made it dependent
on how far the Japanese armed forces were prepared for
it and on the possibility of launching an attack against
the U.S.S.R. without withdrawing her armed forces from
the south, document No. 1230.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1230 will receive exhibit No. 807.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 807 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt numbered

1:

"With respect to the question dealt with in your telegram on Japanese-Russian relations, the following should be taken under consideration: without doubt the opportunity to seize the Siberian Coastal Province and Vladivostok, so vitally necessary to Japanese security, will never be as favorable as at present when Russia's combined strength is strained

to the utmost on the European front. In this situation the following exists:

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

"1) If Japanese estimates of Russian forces in Siberia are accurate, and she is able to overcome Russian resistance in Vladivostok and penetrate into Siberia in the direction of Lake Baikal, then such an undertaking would be very significant to the subsequent development of the war. Japan can not evade the threat to her rear from Russian coastal provinces, it would therefore be best if she would arrive at a decision to attack Vladivostok at the very earliest. There is no question that this intervening time is used by the Russians in cooperation with the Americans for the sole purpose of fortifying the Siberian Coastal areas in order to provide air bases which will constitute a threat to Japan. Therefore, the earlier the rush against Vladivostok takes place the less progress will have been made in these preparations. However, this is all based on the premise that Japan is sufficiently strong for an operation of this nature and will not have to free other forces which would weaken her position against England and America, as for example, in Burma.

"2) If Japan lacks the necessary strength to successfully undertake such an operation then it would naturally be better that she maintain neutral relations

with Soviet Russia."

I omit a few lines, as they will be quoted in connection with some other issue, and continue to quote the last line of page 1:

"By maintenance of neutrality, the risk of a long drawn out war with insufficient forces and particularly with danger of air attacks against the Japanese Home Islands will be avoided. In this respect, Japan must undertake the offensive in some other direction, as for example, India or Australia, in order to contribute effectively to the joint conduct of the war.

"In summing up, the following is to be said
from the German standpoint: a sudden and successful
attack against Soviet-Russia might prove a great boon
for the further conduct of the war to the Tripartite
Powers, but this should only be undertaken if success
can be assured."

Other excercts from this telegram will be read by me in connection with some other questions.

I shall present in evidence a telegram,
No. 433, from Tokyo to Washington, dated July 31, 1941,
proving that postponing the moment of the attack till
the time of a more favourable situation the Japanese
military clique was at the same time afraid of being
late and missing an opportunity of carrying out its

2 3

aggressive plans against the U.S.S.R., document
No. 2593D(2). It is a part of the entire document
which received exhibit No. 603 for identification only.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document No.

2593D(2) will receive exhibit No. 808.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 808 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from this telegram, part 2; page 2 of the English text:

"Needless to say, the Russo-German war has given us an excellent opportunity to settle the northern question, and it is a fact that we are proceeding with our preparations to take advantage of this occasion.

Not only will we have to prepare, however, but we must chose well our chance. In view of the real situation facing our Empire, this should be easily understood.

If the Russo-German war proceeds too swiftly, our Empire would inevitably not have time to take any effective symmetrical action."

To prove that Japan had no reasons to fear an attack on the part of the U.S.S.R., I shall present in evidence a research report, No. 131, dated

December 1, 1945, and called "Japan's Decision to Fight."

This was published by General Headquarters of the Supreme Commander for Allied Powers, document No. 1628.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1628 will receive exhibit No. 809.

("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 809 and received in evidence.)

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, we would like to know what this research report is, what date it purports to speak. According to its fact, it is dated 1 December 1945 which is after the war was over.

THE PRESIDENT: The whole document is tendered for identification. It is on the table before us. I understand it is a SCAP document.

MR. FURNESS: According to its face, the SCAP document is also dated 1 December 1945.

THE PRESIDENT: It looks like a SCAP record of certain events, including this one. It is an army document coming within the express terms of the Charter I think, Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: I know it is, but it speaks of 1 December 1945. Is it Japan's decision at that time or --

THE PRESIDENT: That is the date of the research

report. It is a case of the absence of a date, not of inconsistency between dates.

MR. FURNESS: I suppose I should leave it to to the prosecution to clear it up.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: From this report I quote section "General Situation," Item "E", of a secret operation order No. 1, dated November 1, 1941, issued by the combined navy and signed by Admiral YAMAMOTO, Isooku, Cammander in Chief of the Japanese combined navy in connection with preparing war against the U.S.A. and England. The rest of the document will be used by Mr. English. I quote page 7 of the English text:

"Policy toward the Soviet Union. The strength of Soviet forces on the Soviet-Manchukuoan border is formidable. The Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics is maintaining a vigilant alert awaiting developments. However, if the Empire does not attack the Soviet Union, it is believed that the Soviet Union will not commence hostilities."

THE PRESIDENT: That assigns the date and the source.

MR. FURNESS: Of course, it isn't yet in evidence but I understand it will be put in evidence.

2 3

GENERAL VASILIEV: To show that Germany no doubt appreciated that help which was rendered to it by means of tying up Soviet Army forces in the Far East, I shall read an excerpt from Ribbentrop's telegram to the German Ambassador in Tokyo dated May 15, evidently 1942. The telegram has just been presented by me in evidence, prosecution document No. 1230, exhibit No. 807.

This excerpt is numbered 2 in the English cories of the document. The following words, quoted before, precede the passage I am going to read. I quote them for the sake of preserving logical sequence:

"If Japan lacks the necessary strength to successfully undertake such an operation then it would naturally be better that she maintain neutral relations with Soviet Russia."

The next few lines have direct bearing upon the question under consideration:

"This also eases our burden since in any event Russia must maintain troops in East Siberia in anticipation of a Japanese-Russian conflict."

I present a document showing that in case the Hitlerite Germany would face the tragic moment when her complete defeat became a certainty, Japan planned an attempt to help her ally by offering peaceful mediation between the U.S.S.R. and Germany, even threatening

the U.S.S.R. with opening hostilities against her.

This is an excerpt from the symposium of the Institute of Total War entitled, "The Program of Total War in the First Period," "The Construction of East Asia," drawn up in February, 1942. This entire symposium, document No. 1621, has been presented for identification by Colonel Rosenblit, exhibit No. 689. I present an excerpt in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1621B will receive exhibit No. 810.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 810 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote on page 4 of the English text:

"If there should arise good prospect that peace between Germany and the U.S.S.R. would cause Soviet alienation from America and Britain and reduce the threat against Japan, we shall mediate for peace between Germany and the Soviet Union by bringing, if necessary, pressure to bear at a period when the war situation is favorable to Germany.

"To force peace on the Soviet Union by hinting at a declaration of war against her if she should refuse to suspend hostilities."

I omit part of Item II.

Germany, it shall be the general rule that no efforts will be made to bring about peace between Germany and the Soviet Union. However, we must be prepared to exert great pressure on the Soviet Union in case of unavoidable necessity, and to expect a peace which may not be necessarily satisfactory."

Now I shall pass over to presenting evidence showing that during the war of Germany against the U.S.S.R. the Japanese military clique provided Germany with the information concerning the military and political situation of the U.S.S.R. using for this purpose

Japanese military and diplomatic bodies.

I shall quote an extract from Ribbentrop's telegram to the German Ambassador in Tokyo, dated July 10, 1941, prosecution document No. 571, exhibit No. 771, that has already been offered in evidence to the Tribunal. This excerpt is numbered 3 in the English copies of the document.

"Please thank the Japanese Foreign Minister at this opportunity for having transmitted the telegram from the Japanese Ambassador at Moscow. It would be good if we could receive more news from Russia in this way at regular intervals."

Along with other evidence, the affidavit of witness NOHARA, Komakichi, press agent of the Japanese Embassy in Berlin, dated February 15, 1946, document No. 2074, shows that Ribbentrop's wish was gratified; that is to say, the provision of Germany with the information on military and political conditions in the U.S.S.R. continued on a large scale.

I shall present this affidavit in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2074 will receive exhibit No. 812.

Correction: Prosecution's document No. 2074 will receive exhibit No. 811.

1 2

1 2

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 811, and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote the most important passages from the affidavit.

When asked, "Explain the origin and character of the documents in German and English shown to you which were found on you by the Red Army officer when you were apprehended, and why were these documents on you," the witness answered:

"Answer: The present documents on four sheets of paper which were actually found on me, belonged in the past to the Japanese Embassy in Berlin. As I was a convinced anti-Fascist I was against the war of Japan and Germany against the Soviet Union and her allies. I deliberately kept these documents and intended to use them in the interest of the allies, as I was sure that the day would come when these documents would to a certain extent expose the Japanese war criminals, who had provoked the war against the peace-loving countries and brought their country and their people to a catastrophe. Therefore, I kept those documents and made no attempt to hide or destroy them. When on the 21st of April 1945 I was taken in Strausberg I handed them over to the Soviet officer. The greater part of

these documents were secret. Though it was not my immediate duty, as a press agent, to deal with documents of that kind, yet I was made to be concerned with secret work by the counselor of the Embassy Kavahara Sin."

Correction: Embassy Kavahara.

"My duty was to work at the documents of military and other secret information. The work was considered to be top secret and nobody but Ambassador OSHIMA, the counselor of the Embassy Kavahara and me were initiated in it. The greater part of the present documents which were found about me are copies of memorandums, containing secret information about the number and disposition of the units of the Red Army, its equipment and supplies, the state of the war industry of the Soviet Union and its production: planes, tanks and also manpower of the U.S.S.R. The Japanese Embassy in Berlin received military information of similar nature about the Soviet Union from Japanese Ambassadors in Moscow TATEKAVA and SATO in the form of ciphered telegrams, at which the Counselor Kavahara and me worked afterwards and translated into German. Afterwards the Japanese Embassy in Berlin passed that information to the German Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

"Question: You are being shown the document

24

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 3

of the 19th of January 1945, headed 'War Potential of the Soviet Russia,' in which figures of planes, tanks, oil, etc., produced in the Soviet Union, are omitted. By whom and when was the document drawn up and what does the omission of the figures mean?

"Answer: This document was drawn up by the Counselor Kavahara and me in January, 1945, on the ground of the information, received from SATO, the Japanese Ambassador in Moscow. The omission of the figures is made by the Counselor Kavahara; he wrote them in hand in the 1st copy and handed the copy as it was, to the Germans. This information Kavahara considered top secret.

"Question: Among the documents found about you, there is a document under the title of 'On the Strength of the Red Army.' There is a mark, made in your hand on this document, stating that on the 21st of January, 1942, the military attache in the Japanese Embassy in Moscow, through us, handed the following information to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Under the document it is written in your hand that 'on the 22nd of January, 1942, that information was in the hands of the German Commander-in-Chief.' Explain what those marks on that document mean.

"Answer: This document is a record of secret

information received by the Japanese Embassy in Berlin from the Japanese attache in Moscow on the 21st of January, 1942. That's how the origin of this information was explained to me orally by the Counsel of the Embassy, Kavahara. The record is reproduced by me in this cocument on the ground of draft copies. The next day, on the 22nd of January, after Kavahara and me had worked up this document, the Counselor Kavahara personally handed it to the German Foreign Office. As to the delivery of secret information about the Allies to the Germans by the Japanese Embassy in Berlin, I want to say in addition that from 1939 till 1945 the Japanese Embassy handed, as far as I remember, about 40 communiques to the Germans whenever they were coming from Moscow, London and Tokyo. The contents of those materials, mainly, refer to war-economic power of the U.S.S.R. and her Allies. Part of the materials were summaries of certain investigations concerning different problems, other materials were results of personal observations of the Japanese" -- and other foreigners -- "who passed through the Soviet Union in war-time."

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I omit a question and answer, and pass over to the next page.

"Question: By whose orders did the Japanese

Embassy in Berlin pass the secret information about the U.S.S.R. to the Gormans? "Answer: By the order from Tokyo and the personal order of Ambassador OSHIMA." THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until half past one. (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

G 1 e 2 e 3 b 4

e 4 r g 5 & 6

B 7 a 8 t 0 9

11

13

10

14 15 16

17 18

> 19 20

21 22

> 23 24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE MONITOR: Before we begin, Mr. President, the reading of the Japanese translation of what was read by the Soviet prosecutor was a few lines behind.

I request that we be allowed to finish it up.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I am SHIMANOUCHI, counsel for the defendant OSHIMA. I should like to ask a question to the prosecutor. In the first page of exhibit 811 it is said NOHARA is now detained in the Soviet Union.

The first point of my question is: Why was he detained in the first place? And, when he was being interrogated, whether he was being tried as a war criminal -- whether he was going to be tried as a war criminal, or he was being tried as a war criminal, or that he had been tried already as a war criminal. This is the first point that I should like to ask.

The second point of my question is, according to the exhibit 811, NOHARA is said to be a Japanese national. However, NOHARA was not a pure Japanese; he is a Eurasian born of a German and a Japanese, and that he was merely an employee of a minor -- lesser rank of the Embassy, and that he did not know

the Japanese language very well.

THE MONITOR: Slight correction: The point
I would like to ask is whether, because he is a
Eurasian, is it not true that he does not speak
Japanese very well? And also, second question is,
is it not true that he has a very low rank in the
employ of the Japanese Embassy in Germany?

THE PRESIDENT: Counsel is not at liberty to give evidence at this stage. However, the Russian prosecutor might answer those questions as far as he can.

Minister Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: All I can say is that at the time when he was questioned, NOHARA was not put to trial as a war criminal, nor was he charged with any war crime. He was interned as all the other personnel of Japanese diplomatic mission. What is his status at the present time? I cannot tell at the moment. I will make inquiries and submit the information to the Tribunal as soon as I get it.

As to his racial origin and the extent of his knowledge of the Japanese language, I, unfortunately, cannot give any information to the Tribunal because I do not possess it.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, now, just a minute.

I think we have heard enough about this. I am sure you will want to start making statements of fact which may very properly be the subject of evidence later on, which cannot properly be stated now.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: I have something to ask of the Tribunal. I should like to ask the Tribunal to direct the prosecution to summon NOHARA as witness to the Tribunal on the ground that NOHARA's testimony -- it is very important in determining OSHIMA's case, and that there is a great difference and discrepancy between his testimony and OSHIMA's testimony as appears in OSHIMA's interrogation. And he should be called, I think, for the purpose of crossmexamination.

THE PRESIDENT: The application will be considered.

General Vasiliev -- Mr. Chief Prosecutor.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, a subpoem has issued from this Tribunal at the behest of the defense for the forthwith appearance of former Major General MATSUMURA, Japanese Army. He has been brought here by the Soviet prosecution for the purpose of appearing in Court, presenting his affidavit, and giving cross-examination in accordance with the usual procedure. He will be presented in court within

a day or two, in the orderly procedure of the presentation of the prosecution's case. We, therefore, ask the Court respectfully to suspend the Order for his being ordered to appear forthwith on behalf of the defense for the reasons stated.

THE FRESIDENT: We will treat his appearance here during this stage of the case as a compliance with the Order.

Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I should like to be heard on the matter inasmuch as the subpoena and alias subpoena were issued at my behest. Appearance of the witness on behalf of the prosecution, of course, does not comply with my request that he be brought here for direct testimony on behalf of the defense.

THE PRESIDENT: You might refresh my memory with the facts. What happened in respect to this particular person?

MR. BLAKENEY: The subpoena was issued some months past at the request of General UMEZU for the appearance of General MATSUMURA to testify on his behalf. In requesting issuance of that subpoena, I made the statement that I was unable to say when his attendance for testimony would be required but that his attendance for consultation with counsel was

required forthwith. It having been apparently impossible for the Secretariat to procure service of the subpoena, I requested and secured the issuance of an alias subpoena last week, I believe. No matter what the witness may testify on behalf of the prosecution, I would be limited by the rules of cross-examination from proving by him, even if I desired to in this stage, the matters for defense for which he was originally requested as a witness.

I see nothing in what has just been said
here to suggest any reason that this Tribunal -- that
the subpoena should not be served on the witness
whenever and wherever he can be found. Certainly,
I detect nothing in the Charter to suggest any immunity on the witness for service of process by this
Tribunal. I, therefore, respectfully request that
the Marshal be directed to serve the subpoena on the
witness when he appears in the courtroom if it cannot
be served before.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, this is the position:
You issued a subpoene for him. But, before it was
served, he was approached, apparently, by the prosecution who say they will have him here in the course
of a day or two. The situation is somewhat novel.
However, if he is called here in the course of a day

or two, there will be nothing to prevent you from serving a subpoena.

- 4

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, may I ask the Court to direct that the subpoena, which is now out and which calls for his presenting himself forthwith before this Court, as I understand it, be suspended for the reason that we have had past experience where we have brought affidavits of witnesses — Japanese witnesses — here, and they get in the hands of defense counsel. We have had an unfortunate experience with their testimony when they appear on the witness stand.

Mr. President, the time for the presentation of the defense has not arrived, and we are presenting a witness in accordance with the Court's ruling, in an orderly fashion, and we do not want to have him subpoensed and brought into this court by the Court's Order for the purposes of defense before we have an opportunity of using him as our witness at our time during this prosecution. We have had unfortunate experience in the single instance we know of in the past.

We request to have the Order suspended for the reasons stated.

THE PRESIDENT: The summons is to the court

and not to the witness to place himself in the hands of either the prosecution or the defense. Our only concern is that he comes here at the time stated in the summons.

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. President, in view of the covert charge made by the Chief Prosecutor, I should like to point out that this witness was subpocnaed by the defense long before there was any intimation that he would testify on behalf of the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Tribunal please, if the Chief Prosecutor has any charges to make, I wish he would make them openly. I also request that they be investigated by this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no charge before us agrinst any specific individual, and, therefore, there is nothing for us to investigate.

MR. FURNESS: If he makes them at all, I think he should be specific.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I am satisfied to state what I regard as the Tribunal's position. We have issued an Order. If it is complied with, as it can be by the witness coming here at the time stated, that is the end of the matter as far as we

2

4

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

1

12 13

> 14 15

> > 16

18

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

5

6

8

10

11

14

13

15

4

18

17

19

21

23

24 25 and not to the witness to place himself in the hands of either the prosecution or the defense.

Our only concern is that he comes here at the time stated in the summons.

MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. President, in view of the clever charge made by the Chief Prosecutor, I should like to point out that this witness was subpoenaed by the defense long before there was any intimation that he would testify on behalf of the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Tribunal please, if the Chief Prosecutor has any charges to make, I wish he would make them openly. I also request that they be investigated by this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no charge before us against any specific individual, and, therefore, there is nothing for us to investigate.

MR. FURNESS: If he makes them at all, I think he should be specific.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I am satisfied to state what I regard as the Tribunal's position. We have issued an Order. If it is complied with, as it can be by the witness coming here at the time stated, that is the end of the matter as far as we

are concerned. Further action, disciplinary or otherwise, may be rendered necessary later according to the attitude of the defense or the prosecution towards the witness.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, so that the counsel for prosecution get the matter clearly, here is a witness who we are preparing in the orderly course of our prosecution to present tomorrow or Monday. We are now conferring with him about the preparation for his testimony. In the meantime, we are ordered to present him forthwith in the custody of the Court to serve as a defense witness before, of course, the defense is ready to present its testimony. Are we to now bring him down to this courtroom forthwith and have him stay in the witness room, or may we keep him where he already is and bring him in in the course of the next two or three days in the orderly presentation of our case? May I make that direct inquiry of the Court?

Mr. President, that the Court may know the state of the record, briefly, on 30 July, 1946 a summons to testify was issued to MATSUMURA, Japanese national, USSR, "to appear in person as a witness on behalf of the prosecution."

I am informed by the Clerk that there was a

.

subpoena issued 16 July, 1946 by defense requiring his presence in a summons to testify for defense.

THE PRESIDENT: What does the rest of the summons say?

MR. KEENAN: The summons that I am adverting to now is dated 11 October, 1946, and it reads:
"You are hereby summoned and required to be and appear in person forthwith at the witness room,
No. 123, in the Courthouse of the International
Military Tribunal for the Far East," etc., "then and there to testify on behalf of the accused UMEZU in the above entitled case."

THE PRESIDENT: The defense were the first to summon him, and they summoned him on the 16th of July -- on the 11th of July, was it?

MR. KEENAN: That is correct.

THE FRESIDENT: They were the first to summon him.

MR. KEENAN: But, of course, Mr. President, he is not being called by the defense to testify forth-with during the period of time when the prosecution is proceeding. He is now, Mr. President, being interviewed by the prosecution, will be here in two or three days, and this subpoena takes him out of our control and brings him on behalf of the defense

for thwith here and now to testify on behalf of the defense. And I state to the Court that that identical proceeding, when last followed, ended up with our witness in the office of defense counsel. And afterwards, it was necessary to destroy his credibility, enacted by the prosecution in this questioning, as the Court observed. Those are the facts. Let the chips fall where they may.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the fact is, he is here now in the custody of the Court. He is not required immediately for the purpose of defense. They are not giving evidence. But you are giving evidence, and you have subpoensed him. The Court could make him available to you. You would call him as your witness. And for that purpose, you would be entitled to take a proof of his evidence. We do not want you to put a witness in the box without taking a proof of his evidence.

Pending his production in court to give evidence for the prosecution, the defense could not properly approach him. The defense could cross-examine the witness, and, if not satisfied, they could subpoen him for the defense, or they could insist on the subpoena for him as a witness being complied with. Complaince would be effectively made

with the subpoena at any time after the defense commence to give evidence.

9

8

11 12

10

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

23

25

22

24

MR. FURNESS: May I say to clear the record that the witness about whom the Chief Prosecutor speke was interviewed in my office and was brought out on my own cross-examination and that after that the Court said that I had nothing to explain. If I had had anything to explain I would have explained it then and am ready to explain it now. Prosecutor further said that he had no charge to make against any American counsel.

THE PRESIDENT: He expressly exonerated I recollect the circumstances clearly. I said you. that he had named you but he said no, he had not implicated any American counsel. I think you are unduly sensitive, Major.

. I said the subpoena for the defense could be complied with at any time after the defense gave evidence. That is so. Up to the time they commence to give evidence, of course, the summons does not apply but they will have an opportunity to take proof.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: The documents to which NOHARA referred in his affidavit are presented in evidence together with the affidavit of NOHARA. "ith the permission of the Court I shall not quote them entirely for they are a long enumeration of various

items which characterize the war potential and the 1 war economic potential of the U.S.S.R., and listen-2 ing to them would be tiresome. I shall only briefly 3 enumerate their titles which are necessary for the understanding of the nature of these documents: "On the strength of the Red Army. 6 "The strength of Russian forces before 7 the outbreak of the Russian-German war, "The European Pact of Russia..... 9 "The Far East..... 10 Correction: "The European Part of Russia." "The strength of Russian forces reinforced 12 by mobilization contingents since the outbreak of the 13 14 war. "Casualties during the war (till the 16 beginning of December 1941). 17 ""ar Potential of Soviet Russia.... "Output of military production "Aircraft.... 20 "Tanks.... "Coal.... 22 "011.... 23 "Iron and steel 24 "Aluminum.... 25 "Copper....

8

11

15

18

19

7 8

 "Trucks....

"Manpower....

"Food situation"

I shall read an excerpt from the minutes of interrogation of the defendant OSHIMA dated April 22, 1946, which has already been presented by me in evidence, prosecution document No. 4121, exhibit No. 776. This excerpt proves that NOHARA really was an employee of the Japanese E-mbassy in Berlin.

I quote an excerpt numbered 4 in the English copies of the document, on page 4 of the English text:

"Question: Do you know NOHARA, press-agent of the Japanese Embassy in Berlin?

"Answer: Yes, I do. He worked as interpreter in our Embassy. His father was Japanese, his
mother German, he received German education, was connected with the Embassy and was lately used for radio
interception work. He worked with us unofficially."

RUSSIAN INTERPRETER: Correction: In the document referred to by General Vasiliev the words read as "The European Pact of Russia" should have been read, "The European Part of Russia."

GENERAL VASILIEV: (Continuing) Witness
MATSUMARA who will be introduced to the Tribunal by my

7 8

colleague, Colonel Rosenblit, will give testimony as to the provision of Germany with the information about military and political conditions in the U.S.S.R.

I shall present for identification the record of Ribbentrop's talk with the defendant OSHIMA on March 6, 1943, document No. 2312, concerning the time of the proposed entry of Japan into the war against the U.S.S.R. and the aid which Japan rendered to Germany by tying up the forces of the Soviet Army in the Far East.

I offer apology to the Tribunal on the following account. Though brief excerpts from the record of this talk were in due time processed and distributed to the defense, however, owing to the objections raised by the defense to some of the excerpts being too brief and the attitude of the Tribunal toward this question, we have made a much more complete translation but we succeeded in distributing the English and Japanese copies of it not long before the beginning of this afternoon session of the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2312 will receive exhibit No. 812 for identification
only and the excerpt therefrom bearing the same prosecution document number will receive exhibit No. 812-A.

(Whereupon, prosecution's document
No. 2312 was marked prosecution's exhibit No.
812 for identification; the excerpt therefrom
bearing the same number was marked prosecution's
exhibit No. 812-A and was received in evidence.)
GENERAL VASILIEV: (Reading)

"Ambassador OSHIMA declared that he had received a telegram from Tokyo, and he is to report to the German Foreign Minister, by order of his government, the following:

"The suggestion of the German Government to attack Russia was the subject of a mutual conference between the Japanese Government and Imperial Headquarters, in which the question was exhaustively discussed and minutely probed. The result was the following:

"The Japanese Government thoroughly recognizes the danger which threatens from Russia and has full understanding for the desire of its German ally, that Japan, too, enters into the war against Russia. It is not possible for the Japanese Government, however, in view of her present war situation to enter into the war. It is rather of the conviction that it is in the common interest, not to start the war against Russia now. On the other hand, the Japanese Government will never disregard the Russian question.

"The Japanese Government has the intention to once again, in the future, take the offensive on the other fronts.

"On the declaration of the Ambassador, the German Foreign Minister asked how one conceived, in Tokyo, the future waging of the war. At present, Germany is to a great extent waging war against the common enemies, England and America, alone, while Japan is taking a rather defensive stand. However, it would be more in order if all the powers bound by the Tripartite Pact joined all their forces to jointly defeat net only England and America, but Russia as well. It is not good when one part must fight alone. One should not overstrain the German people's strength. In secret he is concerned that forces could be at work in Tokyo, who are of the opinion -- and who also propagate it -- that Germany would conclude the fight victoriously anyway, and Japan should therefore further consolidate herself before it would make further and supreme efforts.

"The U.S.A. and England were pursuing the strategy that the Allics should at first turn all their strength against Germany and Italy alone, and had also expressed this in CASABLANCA completely openly as their program. Actuality has confirmed this until

5

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

7

12

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

now. Unfortunately, Ambassador SATA in KUIBYSHEV has apparently delivered to the Russians in this matter the assurance of the absolute neutrality of Japan. However, we had to undergo the experience that on the Eastern Front -- especially in STALINCRAD also -fresh Siberian division had fought. We would nevertheless attack the Russians again and again. The situation on the Eastern Front had stabilized itself and a stable Gorman Front had been established except for a small, still existing, gap. However, at the same time we have to fight against England and America more or less by ourselves in Africa, in the air and on all the oceans as well.

"Compared with this, Japan's share was small. Even the battle area in BURMA was small in comparison. Tokyo must therefore understand it when Germany raises the question of whether in the spirit of waging the joint war, it is the correct strategy for Japan not to make full use of her people's strength, while Germany's is strained to the limit. He would like to emphasize again that if Germany would ever become weak, Japan would find herself facing a world coalition which would consist not only of England, America and Russia, but the people's strength /VOLSKRAFT/ of all the countries on earth, as well as that of a bolshevized

1

2

3

4

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

٩

24

Europe. The question was therefore raised whether at this time so exceedingly decisive for the outcome of the war, the strength of the allies was properly distributed and was really being used in the spirit of a joint, total conduct of the war.

"Ambassador OSHIMA answered that what decided the issue for Japan was whether she had sufficient forces and whether her armament capacity was sufficient in order to attack and defeat the Russians, in addition to the enemies Japan already has, without endangering her operations on the other fronts.

Tokyo is afraid of splitting its forces. On the other hand Japan's attitude was in no way purely defensive and just waiting, but a new attack against the U.S.A. and the British will surely take place. Even though he has no detailed reports concerning this, he personally believes that this attack will come in the direction of the Indian Ocean. In any case, however, the belief in an inseparable mutual victory of the allies was a foregone conclusion for Tokyo."

(Omission)

"The German Foreign Minister commented at this point that an infraction of mutual trust was naturally completely out of the question, since this was unshakeable between Germany and Japan. In the matter of the inquiry which was brought up, it was solely a question of the joint conduct of the war, the strategy which is to be jointly carried out, that is, the proper use of the common strength. Germany entirely understands that Japan must first finish constructing her newly won bases and positions and must consolidate her forces. Japan had done this for a year and now when Germany is bearing the brunt of the struggle, Japan should be in a position to be able to apply a new decisive blow against the common enemy. It was in no way a question of mutual trust, but he sometimes is concerned that Japan has the intention of consolidating her forces for yet another year and only later starting a new attack.

"Upon this the Ambassador replied that he did not think so. The intentions of the military leaders in his fatherland were unknown to him; nevertheless, he knew that for a long time Japan had the intention of turning against Russia. But for the time being she evidently did not feel strong enough to do so. If one withdrew the front in the South and

24

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

19

20

21

23 24

25

abandoned several islands to the enemy in order to shift all forces to the North, this could be possible. This would, however, mean a heavy defeat in the South. Both an advance to the South, and at the same time to the North was impossible for Japan."

(Omission)

"The German Foreign Minister then once more brought up the question of a Japanese attack on Russia, by stating that the struggle on the Purma Front as well as in the South was more of a maritime problem and that actually only a few land troops were being employed on all fronts, excepting China. The attack on Russia was therefore in the first place a matter for the Army and the consideration was whether the necessary forces were nevertheless ready for this. OSHIMA replied that the bulk of the Japanese Army was bound in China and on the Burma Front the forces were by no means insignificant either. If Japan should want to attack Russia, she would have to bring almost all the troops from the South into Manchuria. In any case, one did not have enough troops in order to be able to attack Russia with the firm prospect in an early victory."

(Omission)

I pass over to page 4.

"The general strength of the Russian Army amounts to 800,000 men. It was quite natural that the Russians left so many troops at the frontier, as in the course of their history they had always until now made extremely unpleasant experiences with surprise attacks on the part of Japan.

"Concerning our reports on Russia's imports from the U.S.A. via VLADIVOSTOK, OSHIMA thought
that Japan allowed the Russians only one seaway, and
that on this seaway all ships are searched for arms
and ammunition."

THE PRESIDENT: Counsellor SHIMANOUCHI.

MR. SHIMANOUCHI: The document which has just been read by the prosecutor is a completely different one from that which had been given to us Japanese counsel and we did not follow at all what was going on here. I therefore wish to reserve the right to make an objection in connection with this document. Furthermore, even if the document which had been delivered to us were identical to the document which is now being read, I should like to point out that the certificate of origin attached thereto is not sufficiently clear.

THE PRESIDENT: It is as clear as any certificate of a similar type covering documents from Germany, which means that it is clear enough. The defense should be given a correct copy of the document read, if they have not already received one. It is no ground of objection, of course.

Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I think the certificate of origin differs a good deal from most of the certificates from Germany.

THE PRESIDENT: It is a German certificate supplemented by an affidavit in general. The affidavit is being tendered as an exhibit.

MR. FURNESS: All that we have is a certificate from a first lieutenant to the effect that the documents are now in the custody of the United States

Chief of Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality.

THE PRESIDENT: I suggest, Major Furness, that you carefully examine this certificate and the other material supplementing it before you decide to make an objection. I am not asserting you are wrong but I think you are.

General Vasiliev.

 GENERAL VASILIEV: Now I shall present evidence proving that deliberate hampering of Soviet trade shipping in the Far East was one of the ways in which Japan rendered considerable help to Germany in waging war against the U.S.S.R. in the period of

1941-45.

Article 9 of the Portsmouth Treaty of 1905, presented in evidence to the Tribunal, exhibit No. 21, provided that: "Japan and Russia mutually agree not to construct in their respective possessions on the Island of Sakhalin or the adjacent islands, any fortifications or other similar military works. They also respectively engage not to take any military measures which may impede the free navigation of the Straits of La Perouse and Tartary."

I present in evidence the report of the Chief of the U.S.S.R. Naval General Staff dated February 20, 1946, No. 34563S, document No. 1887, showing that the Japanese Government hampered Soviet shipping in the Far East in any possible way, though under the provisions of the Neutrality Pact of 1941 Japan had no right to undertake any actions which could inconvenience the Soviet Union during her war with Germany. This also included trade shipping.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, this document, 1887, apparently is a communication from the Admiral of the fleet to the prosecutor, Minister Golunsky. It is dated February 20, 1946, and therefore it is not a document that was prepared by him during the occurrence of the events of which he is attempting to testify to in this letter. It is not a sworn document and in it he draws conclusions and opinions without setting forth the facts on which they are based. He draws inferences from documents and his conclusions as to what are the ultimate facts from those documents. He comments on those documents and he also comments on newspaper reports. He even draws inferences from the agreements between Japan and Russia and towards the last he sets forth a table which

contains only the barest ultimate facts. All in all, it appears to me, if the Tribunal please, that this document is a mere summation of what the prosecution is trying to prove in this particular phase of the case. I believe it should be excluded on the ground it has absolutely no probative value.

THE PRESIDENT: Minister Golunsky.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, this document has been issued by the Chief of the Naval General Staff of the Soviet Navy and as such comes under Section (d) of Article 13 of the Charter, which provides that: "The Tribunal shall neither require proof of facts of common knowledge, nor of the authenticity of official government documents," I omit several words, "and findings of military or other agencies of any of the United Nations."

THE PRESIDENT: Would that cover a statement by a witness to a prosecutor as to the facts that he would be able to establish if he were called as a witness?

MR. GOLUNSKY: It is a document signed by theTHE PRESIDENT: Yes. A point like this arose
in the Chinese Section, I recollect. We will have to
resolve this in the same way, I take it. I have forgotten what we did then. We will consider this point.

We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1442, a recess was taken until 1505, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Goldberg & Spratt

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal has decided to admit document 1887 on the usual terms, but it may be that some Members of the Court, whether a majority or not I do not know, will pay little regard to it; and they would expect, that, if the matter is really important to the prosecution, they should have the advantage of the evidence of some Russian officer of standing who could testify to these matters.

The objection is overruled.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 1887 will receive exhibit No. 813.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 813 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote a few brief excerpts from the report:

"I inform you that the Noval General Staff of the U.S.S.R. Navy has at its disposal the following data on the measures taken by Japan to tie up the Soviet navigation in the course of World "ar II.

"These measures may be divided into the following three groups:

"1. Closing for navigation the straits con-

19

21

22

23

24 25

7 8

necting the open ross which was a violation of the freedom of the seas and violation of article 9 of the Portsmouth treaty concerning the navigation in the straits of Laperuse.

"2. Examining and holding up of Soviet ships by the Japanese command accompanied by the violation of generally recognised principles of international law:

"3. Attacking and sinking of Soviet ships.

"At the beginning of World War II Japan proclaimed the Straits of Laperuse, Sangar and Korea, her "Naval defensive zones" (Statement N 3º of the Naval Ministry, in the official government Bulletin "Kanpo", December 8, 1941).

"This measure enabled the Japanese authorities to control the Japanese Sea and its outlets and was directed against the U.S.S.R.

"An attempt to establish a control of this kind on the part of Japan had already taken place before Japan entered the war.

"This is testified by the statement of the Japanese Ambassador in Mosco" addressed on August 25, 1941 to the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. to the effect that the shipment from the U.S.A. to Vladivostok of the materials purchased by

the U.S.S.R. creates an "embarrassing and a very delicate situation' for Japan, so far as these purchases are shipped close to the Japanese territory. In connection with this the Japanese government requested that the Soviet government should pay serious attention to that fact, especially to the question of the routes and means of these shipments.

"In reply to this the Soviet government found it necessary to make a statement that it could not but consider the attempt to hinder the trade between the U.S.S.R. and the USA through the Far-Eastern ports an unfriendly act towards the U.S.S.R."

I omit three paragraphs as being immaterial.

Quote:

"Legal status of Soviet trade shipping
(before the declaration of war by the U.S.S.R. on
Japan) was determined by their belonging to a neutral
country. Since the straits were proclaimed by Japan
'naval defensive zones' the neutral Soviet trade ships
might have had the right to go not only through the
Straits of Laperuse (art. 9 of the Portsmouth treaty),
but also through the Sangar, Korean and Formosa
Straits, straits of international importance.

"The Soviet Union was particularly interested in using the Sangar Straits, which directly connect the Japanese Sea with the Pacific.

"The use of Laperuse Straits for navigation is less advantageous. In the first place, the straits connect the Japanese Sea with the Sea of Okhotsk, and the latter with the Pacific through the Kuril Straits, which naturally, makes the route longer and hampers shipping, and secondly, Soviet ships can pass through the Laperuse Straits from January to April only with the help of powerful icebreakers.

"The Soviet Government frequently requested that the Japanese governments open the Sangar Straits free from ice in the winter months for Soviet trade

ships, but those requests were declined under the protest that this zone was a defensive one.

"By way of compromise the Japanese suggested that Soviet ships navigate through the Korean Straits and further north, to the east of the Kyushu and Honshu Islands."

I omit a few lines. Quote:

"Besides the fact, that the route through the Korean Straits indicated by the Japanese was disadvantageous, it was dangerous for navigation and threatened the safe sailing of Soviet vessels."

I omit a few lines. Quote:

"The Straits of Laperuse were practically closed since the Japanese had left only two narrow fairways for the passage of Soviet ships."

ment in the form of a table that from August 1941 to the end of 1944 the Japanese authorities held up 178 Soviet commercial ships in the Pacific; three of these ships were held up by force of arms, and eight were led away into Japanese ports.

I shall present in evidence a document proving that as soon as Germany attacked the Soviet Union, MATSUOKA, Japanese Foreign Minister hastened to assure the German Government that the USA would

not be in a position to deliver military supplies to the Soviet Union by the Pacific route, though that action was at variance with the Neutrality Pact and international law accepted by all civilized countries. I shall read an excerpt from a telegram of the German Ambassador in Japan sent from Tokyo to Berlin on June 22, 1941, No. 1012 which has already been presented by me in evidence (Prosecution Doc. No. 4033-D, exhibit No. 795-A.)

I quote item 3 of this telegram in the English translation, It is numbered 2 on page 2 containing MATSUOKA's statement made to the German Ambassador that (quote):

"For himself he could once again assert that the United States would not be in a position to deliver military supplies to the Soviet Union by the Pacific route. The Japanese cabinet would certainly be of the same opinion."

In confirmation of the clearly hostile stand of the Japanese Government toward the Soviet Union as to the delivery of American materials, I shall offer in evidence telegram No. 487 to the Japanese Ambassador in Washington from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Tokyo dated August 20, 1941 (document No. 15-F-6). The telegram has been taken from the symposium "Pearl Harbor."

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 15-F-6 will receive exhibit No. 814.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 814 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote the following excerpt from this telegram (part 2):

"If it becomes definitely known that the United States is shipping iron, airplanes and other materials by way of Japanese coastal waters to assist Soviet Russia, this fact would unnecessarily provoke the feelings of the Japanese people, and it cannot be said that it will not have an unfavorable effect on the question of readjusting Japanese-American relations -- a question which is at the present stage a very delicate one. We would like,

,

therefore, to see the United States refrain from such action. Will you take a good opportunity and tactfully call the attention of the United States authorities to this fact? Today I personally called the attention of the American Ambassador to it."

authorities hampering the Soviet Trade Shipping were taken by Japan in full accord with the German Government, I shall read an excerpt from the record of Ribbentrop's talk with OSHIMA on June 24, 1942, which has already been presented by me in evidence (document No. 1372, exhibit No. 778).

This excerpt contains a short note handed to Ribbentrop by the Ambassador OSHIMA during their talk. The excerpt is No. 2 on the English copies of the document.

That is what OSHIMA said:

"1. Since Japan entered the war, 20 Russian merchantmen, totaling 102,000 tons, with a maximum loading capacity of 113,124 tons have entered the harbor of Vladivostok. During their voyage, these ships were searched by units of the Japanese Navy. The search revealed that the freight consisted mainly of foodstuffs, flour, sugar, vegetable oil, etc. and contained no armaments or munitions.

"2. Apparently, the transport of these goods to Vladivostok was carried out in most cases after reloading in the harbor of Petropavlovsk. The occupation of the western Aleutian Islands by Japanese fighting forces will make this method very difficult in the future."

To prove that the hostile actions of the Japanese military as regards Soviet Shipping in the Far East were in many cases carried out quite openly, I shall present to the Tribunal a number of documents.

I respectfully request the Tribunal to take into consideration the following: I shall present in evidence a number of documents, the originals of which are in Russian, relating to detention and sinking of Soviet vessels. These entire documents have been translated into English and Japanese, reproduced and distributed to the Tribunal and to the defense. As the reading of entire documents would take much time, I, with the permission of the Court, shall read only brief excerpts containing the most important passages from these documents.

I shall produce in evidence the report of March 20, 1946, of the Military Prosecutor of the Pacific Ocean Area of the U. S. S. R. (document No. 2232).

The report states that on April 17, 1943,
the Soviet Ship "Sergey Kirov" sailing with a cargo of
foodstuffs from Petropavlovsk to Kamchatka to Vladivostok through the Korean Straits was held up by a
Japanese destroyer and was brought under the ascort
of the destroyer to the Tokyo Bay where she was un-

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Blewett.

lawfully held under arrest for six days.

I may have anticipated the offering of this document.

I am not sure that the prosecution did offer it, but
he gave us the number of it.

is being offered in evidence, we object on the same grounds as the document 1887, which was given No. 813, exhibit. This document, if the Court please, and the succeeding ones referred to by the prosecution, are simply reports from officials and in the same category as 1887; and in addition to the objection placed against 1887, exhibit No. 813, we also object to these documents on the ground of materiality. It would seem that the Japanese in time of war had the right under the law to fortify themselves in their own waters and to take the necessary precautions to

protect its own shipping, and also to protect its neutrality in so far as contraband was concerned.

THE PRESIDENT: The decision on document 1887 covers this case. We repeat the observations made when this decision was given.

The objection is overruled.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2232 will receive exhibit No. 815.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 815 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote the following excerpt from the above-mentioned report:

"In spite of compliance with all the established rules of navigation in the vicinity of Japanese Islands, at 10:00 hours on April 17, 1942, near the Island of 'Mikura Jima' latitude.33 degrees 30 minutes north and longitude 140 degrees 02 minutes. east, the said ship was stopped by a Japanese destroyer which without finding out the nationality of the ship, the nature of her cargo and her route, and regardless of the protests of Captain Ushakov, proposed that the ship follow them into the Tokyo Bay.

"In spite of non-resistence on the part of

'the crew of the ship, in executing the orders given from the destroyer, the latter was repeatedly threatening to commit violence against the ship, and wantonly, fired two volleys from her guns, and, likewise, twice at night machine-gunned the ship."

I shall present in evidence the report of March 22, 1946, of the Military Prosecutor of the Pacific Ocean Area of the U. S. S. R. based on the results of the investigation of the circumstances of the detention of the Soviet Ship "Dvina" by the Japanese ships in the Straits of Laperuse in July, 1943. (Document No. 2325).

The PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document.

No. 2325-A will receive exhibit No. 816.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned document was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 816 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote brief excerpts from this report containing the gist of the matter:

"On July 16, 1943 at 10 hours the ship 'Dvina', under command of Captain Peer and having a load of 900 tons of chrome ore and with 30 passengers aboard, left Vladivostok on a voyage bound for Portland of the U.S.A."

I continue to quote on page 2:

"On July 20 having passed the 'Rock of Danger,' the ship was stopped at 11 A. M. by a Japanese patrol-boat, and regardless of the protest of the captain, she was directed to Port Otomari."

I omit five paragraphs.

"Peer handed a written protest concerning
the illegal detention of the ship to the prosecutor
who did not give him any receipt for it. A copy of
the protest addressed to the Consul of the U. S. S. R.
was not accepted by the prosecutor."

I continue to quote, page 3:

"On July 26 the prosecutor called Peer for interrogation during which he shouted and was rude to him, accusing the latter of violating the Japanese territorial waters."

I omit one and one-half paragraphs.

"On August 10 a court official came to Peer,
who was in custody and announced him the sentence of
the Japanese court, according to which Peer was found
guilty of unlawful violation of the Japanese territorial
waters, and sentenced to 100 days imprisonment or fine
of 2000 Japanese yen. Peer refused to pay the fine,
stating that the sentence of the court was unlawful,
and continued to sit in custody.

"In connection with this the prosecutor called Peer for an interrogation nearly every day and subjecting him to illtreatment and to indignities categorically insisted that the fine be paid and recommending as a means to raise the funds to sell a part of cargo fuel and the ship's equipment, also agreeing to be paid in Soviet currency yet Peer refused categorically to fulfill these demands.

"On August 25 the prosecutor set Captain Peer free, returning him all the documents of the ship, and permitting the ship 'Dvina' to go on her voyage."

I continue to quote, page 4:

"Thus the Japanese military, court and police authorities detained the Soviet ship 'Dvina' without any ground for thirty-five days and subjected the Soviet sailors to indignities."

I shall adduce in evidence the report of

April 4, 1946 of the Military Prosecutor of the

Pacific Ocean Area based on the results of the in
vestigation of the circumstances of detaining the

Soviet trade vessels "Ingul" in the Laperuse Strait

in April 1943 (document No. 2311).

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2311 will receive exhibit No. 817.

.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote brief excerpts from this report:

"The ship 'Ineul' following its course in the northern fair-water of the Laperuse Strait, northern latitude 45 degrees 49 minutes and eastern longitude 141 degrees 53 minutes, was on April 29, 1943, at 9:42 hours stopped by a Japanese war-ship."

I continue to quote the last phrase on page 2:

"Without giving a special accusation the ship
'Ingul' was kept under arrest in the Port 'Otomari'
till 13:15 hours of June 23, 1943, i.e., 60 days."

I shall offer in evidence the Reports of March 20, 1946, of the Military Prosecutor of the Pacific Ocean Area based on the results of the investigation of the circumstances of the sinking and capturing of Soviet ships 'Kretchet', 'Svirstroy', 'Sergey Lazo,' and 'Simpheropal' in the harbor of Hong Kong in December, 1941, where these ships were under recondition. I present in evidence a report on the circumstances of the sinking of the ship 'Krechet,' document No. 2315.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2315 will receive exhibit No. 818.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 818 and

received in evidence.)

I quote brief excerpts containing the gist of the matter:

"That at the end of August, 1941, the ship
'Krechet' arrived at the harbor of Hong Kong to be put
under recondition. On December 8, 1941, the recondition
of the ship was interrupted because of the opening
of hostilities between Japan and U.S.A. and Great
Britain.

"To avoid the damaging of the ship during artillery bombardments of the docks by the Japanese forces, the ship 'Krechet' was led off to the roadstead state flag of the Soviet Union being on the stern, and other flags painted on her deck and boards. There were no other ships belonging to any other country on the roadstead.

"Late in the afternoon of Tecember 14, 1941, artillery bomberdment of the ship 'Krechet' was begun from the Koulun Island, occupied by the Japanese."

I omit a few lines.

"The ship was ablaze and in about two hours sank.

"The witnesses: the captain of the ship 'Krechet' Bazhanov, the senior radio-operator of the ship, Pokrytiuk, the mechanic of the ship 'Svirstroy',

4 5

7

ìo

11 12

18

15 16

17 18

19

20

22

24 25

Iordansky and others estimated that there were 34 shells discharged by the Japanese armed forces at the ship 'Krechet' from the distance of less than half a mile."

I quote the last but one paragraph on page 2:

"During the months that the crew stayed in

Hong Kong they were constantly subjected to indignities
by the Japanese, who best them, robbed them of their

personal things, money in foreign currency and food,

and as a result of it the crew of the ship 'Krechet'

were half starving and suffered from inanition and

various diseases."

I present in evidence a report on the circumstances of the sinking of the ship "Svirstroy,"
document No. 2309.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2309 will receive exhibit No. 819.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 819 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote brief excerpts:

"That since July, 1941, the ship 'Svirstroy'
had been overhauled in the docks of the English
company 'Pampy-Dock' thong Kong, and by the beginning

. 6

of December, 1941, she was 80-90 per cent ready.

"On December 8, 1941, the Japanese troops made a surprise attack on Hong Kong from the north and drove the English troops defending the town back to the Victoria Island.

"In order to avoid the Japanese troops mistaking the Soviet ship for an English or American one, the crew led out the ship 'Svirstroy' to the roadstead and put her far from the other ships, keeping at a distance of 200 meters from the shore; large state flags with the inscription "The U.S.S.R" on them were painted on the roof of the round-house and on the boards.

"Although it was obvious that what the nationality of the ship 'Svirstroy' was and that she belonged to the Merchantile Marine of the Soviet Union the Japanese planes twice bombed her, but without any results. After this on December 18, the Japanese forces began artillery ranging from the shore batteries and opened gun fire on the ship 'Svirstroy.' Five shells directly hit the hull of the ship, considerably demaging her and the deck-structures.

"The 3rd mate Kovernikov and baker Elagin
were killed during the bombardment. Stoker Krivoruchko
was killed and sailor Bochko badly wounded during one
of the bombardments."

of December, 1941, she was 80-90 per cent ready.

"On December 8, 1941, the Japanese troops made a surprise attack on Hong Kong from the north and drove the English troops defending the town back to the Victoria Island.

"In order to avoid the Japanese troops mistaking the Soviet ship for an English or American one, the crew led out the ship 'Svirstroy' to the roadstead and put her far from the other ships, keeping at a distance of 200 meters from the shore; large state flags with the inscription "The U.S.S.R" on them were painted on the roof of the round-house and on the boards.

"Although it was obvious that what the nationality of the ship 'Svirstroy' was and that she belonged to the Merchantile Marine of the Soviet Union the Japanese planes twice bombed her, but without any results. After this on December 18, the Japanese forces began artillery ranging from the shore batteries and opened gun fire on the ship 'Svirstroy.' Five shells directly hit the hull of the ship, considerably damaging her and the deck-structures.

"The 3rd mate Kovernikov and baker Elagin were killed during the bombardment. Stoker Krivoruchko was killed and sailor Bochko badly wounded during one of the bombardments."

I omit a few lines:

"As the crew of the ship 'Svirstroy' had left
the ship during the bombardment, they could not have
taken food and personal belongings with them, for a
month the Japanese authorities did not allow the Soviet
sailors to return to the ship assuring them that the
ship was guarded by them. But when the Soviet sailors
succeeded to get there, they found out that the Japanese
flag had been hoisted on the ship and the Japanese
had given her a trophy number."

The report concludes by saying that the ship was put out of commission and sank as a result of the damage sustained due to the bombardment and plundering.

Now I offer in evidence a report of the ship 'Sergey Lazo', document No. 2310.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2310 will receive exhibit No. 820.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 820 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote brief excerpts:

"On December 11, 1941, the ship 'Sergey Lazo'
was twice bombed by Japanese planes, but the bombs
missed her. The ship had identification signs and the

state flag of the Soviet Union."

I interrupt the quotation. After the crew, by order of the Japanese authorities, had left the ship -- I continue to quote on page 2:

"The Japanese authorities did not allow the crew of the ship 'Sorgey Lazo' to go aboard their ship, but it was noticed that the Japanese replaced people on the Soviet ships every day and that the Japanese flag was hoisted on them."

I omit a few lines and then quote the description of condition of the ship when the Soviet crew got aboard it:

"They found out that the Japanese had plundered the deck equipment, the skiper-pilot, buffet, caboose and fire equipment, the life-rescuing equipment, overalls, things pertaining to cultural entertainment, the ship radio-station, personal belongings of the crew, food, details of machines, various tools and materials."

I call it to the attention of the Court that the Japanese authorities not only unlawfully opened fire on the Soviet ships 'Svirstroy' and 'Sergey Lazo' which were in Hong Kong, and captured them, but also gave to them trophy numbers and hoisted the Japanese flags.

I offer in evidence a report on the ship

'Simpheropol,' document No. 2308.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted in the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2308 will receive exhibit No. 821.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 821 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote a brief excerpt showing in what state the ship was at the moment the Soviet sailors were allowed to see her after her having been shelled and used by the Japanese authorities, page 2 of the English document:

"They found out that there was a hole in the hull of the ship 'Simpheropol' made by the artillery shell which had hit the left upper deck of the bow, that the cabin doors were torn away, the writing tables broken, the velvet from the sofas cut off. Besides, the deck equipment, the pilot, skiper, buffet caboose and fire equipment, the life-rescuing equipment, overalls, personal belongings of the crew, things pertaining to cultural entertainment, cabin equipment, the ship radio station and the whole stock of food for the crew were plundered, and some damage was deliverately done to the engine room."

I shall present in evidence--

THE PRESIDENT: Before you go further, it is noticed that the ships mentioned in exhibits 819 and 820 are different ships, but the two persons killed or wounded on the ships bear the same rages.

There may be an explanation.

MR. GOLUNSKY: If the Tribunal please, probably there was a mistake in translation, because in the Russian document they bear different names.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, obviously.

Have you offered document No. 2308? Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2308 was given exhibit No. 821.

GENERAL VASILEV: I shall present in evidence the affidavit of the witness Budarin, former first mate of the Soviet ship Perekop, who was interrogated on March 14, 1946.

In this affidavit it is testified that in December 1941 the Japanese aircraft made pirate attacks on the Soviet trade ship Perekop, sank that ship, and that the crew for a long time was held in Japanese captivity, the conditions of which were horrible (document No. 2305).

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document No. 2305 will receive exhibit No. 822.

> (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 822, and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote brief excerpts from the affidavit:

"The ship was not armed; we had neither a gun, nor a single machine-gun, there were only a few rifles for guarding the ship. It was a most harmless commercial timber-carrying ship."

I pass over to the events of December 17, page 3 of the English text:

"It was about 9 a.m. The aircraft made two or three circles and then made for the ship. The captain and I watched it through the binoculars and when it came nearer, we saw on its wings the Japanese 'sun' the red circles which showed that was a Japanese aircraft. The plane was making for the ship, and when it was almost directly above it, two bombs were dropped and fell off the starboard (near the engine-department), but did not inflict any damage."

I pass over to the events of December 18, page 4 of the English text:

"I saw 17 twin-engined planes. They fell in

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

two groups and made for the ship, one (there were 9 of them) were making for the bow, the other 8 for the stern.

"The identification signs (flags on the holds)
of our ship were clearly seen, we had hung out our
identification flags, the ensign was new and fluttered
in the breeze, its colour and emblem brightly displayed.
The planes attacked the ship and started bombing and
machine-gunning at low flight. . "

I omit a few lines and quote the last but one line of this page.

"Bombs hit the bow, the mate's storeroom where 4 men were instantly killed, the hold N 1 and 2. Two fires broke out on the bow and on the stern, the bridge was destroyed, plaster and all other life-saving equipment was torn away."

I omit a few lines.

"The ship was sinking fast; now the planes began dropping bombs not on the ship, but on the men in the water who were constantly machine-gunned at the same time.

"It was in the water that Stokers Onipko, Ogarkov, and Engineer Budoyan were killed."

It is seen from the rest of the affidavit that in the course of one and a half years a group of Soviet

two groups and made for the ship, one (there were 9 of them) were making for the bow, the other 8 for the stern.

of our ship were clearly seen, we had hung out our identification flags, the ensign was new and fluttered in the breeze, its colour and emblem brightly displayed. The planes attacked the ship and started bombing and machine-gunning at low flight. . "

I omit a few lines and quote the last but one line of this page.

"Bombs hit the bow, the mate's storeroom where 4 men were instantly killed, the hold N 1 and 2. Two fires broke out on the bow and on the stern, the bridge was destroyed, plaster and all other life-saving equipment was torn away."

I omit a few lines.

"The ship was sinking fast; now the planes began dropping bombs not on the ship, but on the men in the water who were constantly machine-gunned at the same time.

"It was in the water that Stokers Onipko, Ogarkov, and Engineer Budoyan were killed."

It is seen from the rest of the affidavit that in the course of one and a half years a group of Soviet

two groups and made for the ship, one (there were 9 of them) were making for the bow, the other 8 for the stern.

"The identification signs (flags on the holds)
of our ship were clearly seen, we had hung out our
identification flags, the ensign was new and fluttered
in the breeze, its colour and emblem brightly displayed.
The planes attacked the ship and started bombing and
machine-gunning at low flight. . "

I omit a few lines and quote the last but one line of this page.

"Bombs hit the bow, the mate's storeroom where 4 men were instantly killed, the hold N 1 and 2. Two fires broke out on the bow and on the stern, the bridge was destroyed, plaster and all other life-saving equipment was torn away."

I omit a few lines.

"The ship was sinking fast; now the planes began dropping bombs not on the ship, but on the men in the water who were constantly machine-gunned at the same time.

"It was in the water that Stokers Onipko, Ogarkov, and Engineer Budoyan were killed."

It is seen from the rest of the affidavit that in the course of one and a half years a group of Soviet

sailors saved from the sunken ship were first placed on the island of Great Natuna, then on the island of Borneo, in Singapore, once more on Borneo, again on Natuna, and finally again in Singapore, being transferred by order of the Japanese authorities and enduring all sorts of calamities and indignities.

Only on June 1, 1943, they were allowed to return to their country.

I shall offer in evidence a copy of the protest by Levchenko, Captain of the motor vessel 'Maikop,' of July 1, 1942, concerning the circumstances under which the motor vessel was sunk by the Japanese aircraft in December 1941, document No. 1889.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1889 will receive exhibit No. 823.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 823, and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote brief excerpts from this document containing the gist of the matter.

"On 14th December 1941, motor vessel'Maikop' which is the property of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, sailed under my command, with 12 officers (including myself) and 23 members of the crew (total

35 persons), from the port of Soerabaja (Java) for Vladivostok, carrying a cargo of 1994 metric tons of liquid cocoanut oil, in accordance with instructions received from the Far Eastern Department of U.S.S.R. Merchant Marine.

"On 20th December 1941, at 7.00 a.m., the motor vessel 'Maikop' was passing 33 miles south of Sarangani Islands, heading East-North-East. At about 7.10 a.m., two single-engine airplanes (one hydroplane and one land plane) were sighted, approachus from East."

I omit a few lines.

"I could clearly see red circles on the wings and fuselages of said airplanes, which shows that they were of Japanese nationality.

"The weather was bright and clear, with good visibility and the U.S.S.R. flag was flying over the stern of our ship. There is absolutely no doubt that our U.S.S.R. flag could be clearly seen and distinguished, as well as the name of our ship, which was painted on both sides of the 'Maikop's' bridge.

"First Attack: Nevertheless, at 7.40 a.m., one of the airplanes (the land plane) dropped two bombs aimed at our ship; the bombs fell not far from our vessel, one about 8 metres and the other about

15 metres from the 'Maikop.'"

Further is given the description of several bombings; and then I continue to quote the protest, on page 4 of the English text.

"As a result of the above damage, sustained by my ship, motor vessel 'Maikop', through bombing attacks by Japanese planes, the ship sank completely at about 2.00 a.m., 26th Lecember 1941, near the village of Makar."

I shall present in evidence the report of the Chief Military Prosecutor of the Navy and River Fleet of the U.S.S.R., dated February 19, 1946, No. 0483, composed on the basis of data obtained by the investigation of the circumstances of the shipwreck of the Soviet tanker "Mariupol," document No. 2072.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2072 will receive exhibit No. 824.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 824, and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote brief excerpts from this report.

"The tanker 'Mariupol' was sailing in November 1943 from the United States of America to the

23

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

15 metres from the 'Maikop.'"

Further is given the description of several bombings; and then I continue to quote the protest, on page 4 of the English text.

"As a result of the above damage, sustained by my ship, motor vessel 'Maikop', through bombing attacks by Japanese planes, the ship sank completely at about 2.00 a.m., 26th December 1941, near the village of Makar."

I shall present in evidence the report of the Chief Military Prosecutor of the Navy and River Fleet of the U.S.S.R., dated February 19, 1946, No. 0483, composed on the basis of data obtained by the investigation of the circumstances of the shipwreck of the Soviet tanker "Mariupol," document No. 2072.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 2072 will receive exhibit No. 824.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 824, and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote brief excerpts from this report.

"The tanker 'Mariupol' was sailing in November 1943 from the United States of America to the

11

13 14

12

3

5

6

9

10

15 16

> 17 18

19 20

21

22

24

Soviet Union with a cargo of 8901 tons of Iso-octane. While passing through the First Kurilsky Strait on November 14, 1943, at 18.04 hours in the territorial waters of Japan near the Cape Kotamari-Saki at the point-Lattitude 50° 48 m. north, longitude 156°31 m. east, the tanker ran onto rocks.

"The tanker Mariupol' remained at the place of the shipwreck till January 23, 1944, and help being not rendered, the ship and 9700 tons of cargo were lost."

I omit a few lines.

"The tanker 'Tuapse' of great cargo capacity arrived at the area of the shipwreck 2 hours after the incident had taken place and had actual possibility to render help to the tanker 'Mariupol' by completely unloading it and towing it from the rocks.

"To approach the tanker 'Mariupol' the Soviet ships had to get permission from the Japanese government. This permission was given when 35 days had passed since the shipwreck, and the wrecked ship was already in a hopeless condition, as its hull was damaged by the winter storms."

I conclude my statement with a presentation of several documents proving that up till 1945, inclusive, the Japanese Government, including the

Soviet Union with a cargo of 8901 tons of Iso-octane. While passing through the First Kurilsky Strait on November 14, 1943, at 18.04 hours in the territorial waters of Japan near the Cape Kotamari-Saki at the point-Lattitude 50° 48 m. north, longitude 156°31 m. east, the tanker ran onto rocks.

"The tanker Mariupol' remained at the place of the shipwreck till January 23, 1944, and help being not rendered, the ship and 9700 tons of cargo were lost."

I omit a few lines.

"The tanker 'Tuapse' of great cargo capacity arrived at the area of the shipwreck 2 hours after the incident had taken place and had actual possibility to render help to the tanker 'Mariupol' by completely unloading it and towing it from the rocks.

"To approach the tanker 'Mariupol' the Soviet ships had to get permission from the Japanese government. This permission was given when 35 days had passed since the shipwreck, and the wrecked ship was already in a hopeless condition, as its hull was damaged by the winter storms."

I conclude my statement with a presentation of several documents proving that up till 1945, inclusive, the Japanese Government, including the

defendants TOJO and SHIGEMITSU, repeatedly proclaimed their foyalty to the alliance with Hitlerite Germany.

The first document on this question I am going to present in evidence is an announcement of the Japanese Board of Information, dated January 21, 1943, concerning the conclusion of economic agreements between Germany, Italy, and Japan, and the text of the article published in the symposium of Official Announcements Concerning Foreign Relations, 1943.

I present this book for identification, document No. 1210 B & C, and the announcement and the article in evidence. The book received exhibit No. 50 for identification only.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1210 B & C will receive exhibit No. 825.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 825, and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from the announcement.

"These agreements possess the same period of validity as the Tripartite Pact, the purpose of which they are to substantiate in the field of economy. In this respect they may be considered as the extension

defendants TOJO and SHIGEMITSU, repeatedly proclaimed their loyalty to the alliance with Hitlerite Germany.

The first document on this question I am going to present in evidence is an announcement of the Japanese Board of Information, dated January 21, 1943, concerning the conclusion of economic agreements between Germany, Italy, and Japan, and the text of the article published in the symposium of Official Announcements Concerning Foreign Relations, 1943.

I present this book for identification, document No. 1210 B & C, and the announcement and the article in evidence. The book received exhibit No. 50 for identification only.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution's document

No. 1210 B & C will receive exhibit No. 825.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 825, and was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from

GENERAL VASILIEV: I quote an excerpt from the announcement.

"These agreements possess the same period of validity as the Tripartite Pact, the purpose of which they are to substantiate in the field of economy. In this respect they may be considered as the extension

and re-inforcement of the Tripartite Pact. Japan,
Germany and Italy have constantly been strengthening
their political cooperation established by the Tripartite Pact and now, by concluding these agreements,
they intend to prosecute war against their common enemy
through the formulation of a grand economic plan and
by employing the total combined strength of the two
great economic spheres of Greater East Asia and Europe
and, at the same time, to lay the foundation for
permanent economic cooperation between these spheres
after the war."

I quote an excerpt from this article.

"The economic agreements which have just been concluded are agreements which give concrete expression to the spirit of the Tripartite Pact in the field of economy. The fact that these agreements have been concluded is in itself a demonstration that the construction of the new order is being further substantiated and that economic collaboration among the three Powers will henceforth be rendered increasingly closer."

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until half past nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Friday, 18 October 1946, at 0930.)